

















**The Four Gospels**  
**Harmonised and Translated**

**MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH**

# The Four Gospels

Harmonised and Translated

From the *Daily Chronicle* of August 30, 1894 \*

COUNT TOLSTOY AND HIS TRANSLATORS

THE EDITOR OF THE *DAILY CHRONICLE*

SIR—I kindly request you to insert in your paper the following advertisement. I utterly the greater part of my works are published in Russian, but are coming out as translations in foreign tongues. The right of translation I freely accord without exception to everyone who would like to undertake the trouble of translating. Putting myself to have my ideas spread I allow them to be correctly interpreted. Yet it often occurs that, firstly, translators translate either from a printed manuscript or from bad translations in some foreign tongue, and, secondly, it comes to pass sometimes that the translators are so deficient in the Russian language as well as the one in which they translate that they completely misinterpret the original and thirdly, that they sometimes unite several articles, *ad libitum* under one title substituting the rows for mere excluding whole passages which does not please them or do not answer their purpose, declaring such mutilated editions to be the only ones sanctioned by the author. I therefore think proper to make known for those who would like to read a true version of my works that I hereby reward shall mark out among other translations those which I consider to be correct by making a notice that the same translations have been done from genuine texts and with my consent. With true regard, yours truly  
I EQ TOLSTOY

11-23 August 1894

From the *Daily Chronicle* of August 31, 1894

"Apropos of Count Tolstoy's interesting letter in our issue of yesterday we have authority for stating that the Count has already begun to apply his new method with regard to translations from his works. One of the ablest of English scholars in Russia is at present engaged with the Count's express sanction and under his superintendence in rendering into English from the Russian MS. a work which the Count regards as of great importance. We have no authority to indicate its nature further than to state that it is of a theological character and likely to be of world-wide interest. The work of translation we understand is no easy task, owing partly to the subject, and partly to the style of the original. There are certain terminologies used in it, the precise translation of which is at once difficult and essential.

From the *Daily Chronicle* of January 4, 1895

"The reply which Count Tolstoy has addressed to the critics of his last book, *The Kingdom of God Within Us*, is, we hear, to be followed before long by the publication of the translation of the important work which so long ago as August 30 last we informed our readers was in preparation, and which, it was then hoped, would have been published by the end of the year just past. The translation has been carefully made by one of our ablest Russian scholars, under the written authorisation of the Count, and has (the translator avers) given as much trouble—such are the difficulties of rendering the original into equivalent English—as an original work would."

Conformably with my recd-  
eration in the London Daily  
Chronicle of August 30. 1894,\*  
I hereby Certify that this  
revising of my work, The  
four Gospels Harmonised and  
translated has been made by  
a competent translator and  
with my consent.  
Leo Tolstoy  
October 1<sup>st</sup> 1894.

\* See preceding page.

# The Four Gospels

Harmonised and Translated

By

Leo Tolstoy

IN THREE PARTS

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT INTO ENGLISH  
AT THE REQUEST OF THE AUTHOR

*PART I*

*With Facsimile of Count Tolstoy's Autograph Imprimatur*

CROYDON  
THE BROTHERHOOD PUBLISHING COMPANY  
LONDON  
WALTER SCOTT LTD.

1895





## TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

---

IT is at Count Tolstoy's express wish that I have undertaken the translation of his book on the Gospels. Though written nearly eighteen years ago, about the same time as his *Confession*, which may be regarded as an introduction to the present work, it was published for the first time this autumn. Unfortunately, owing to the impossibility of its being published in Russia, the Genevan edition is disfigured by numerous typographical mistakes. I have taken the greatest pains to avoid errors of this kind, and to provide the English reader with a faithful rendering of the Russian original.

September 21, 1894.



THE FOUR GOSPELS  
HARMONISED AND TRANSLATED



**Part the First**



## CONTENTS OF PART THE FIRST

---

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| PREFACE . . . . .  | xv   |
| INTRODUCTION . . . . .   | 1-36 |
| I. The Annunciation of True Happiness made by Jesus Christ . . . . .                   | 1    |
| II. Object with which the Gospels were written . . . . .                               | 4    |
| III. The Intelligence of Life . . . . .  | 6    |
| IV. In what the Intelligence of Life, as revealed in Jesus Christ, consisted . . . . . | 33   |
| V. Recapitulation . . . . .  | 35   |

### CHAPTER I

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| INCARNATION OF THE INTELLIGENCE OF LIFE . . . . .   | 37-110 |
| I. The Birth of Jesus Christ . . . . .              | 37     |
| II. The Childhood of Jesus Christ . . . . .         | 41     |
| III. John the Baptist . . . . .                     | 44     |
| IV. The Baptism and Preaching of John . . . . .     | 48     |
| V. General Idea of the Teaching of John . . . . .   | 52     |
| VI. Temptation of Jesus in the Wilderness . . . . . | 54     |
| VII. Visit to the Marriage Feast at Cana . . . . .  | 93     |
| VIII. The first Preaching of Jesus . . . . .        | 94     |
| IX. The first Disciples . . . . .                   | 95     |
| X. The Preaching of Jesus at Nazareth . . . . .     | 100    |
| XI. Recapitulation . . . . .                        | 103    |

## CHAPTER II

|   | PAGE    |
|---|---------|
| THE NEW LIFE. REJECTION OF THE JEWISH GOD . . .           | 111-172 |
| I. General Remarks . . . . .                              | 111     |
| II. Abrogation of the Law of the Sabbath . . . . .        | 118     |
| III. Healing of the Woman on the Sabbath Day . . . . .    | 124     |
| IV. The Call of Matthew . . . . .                         | 128     |
| V. Abrogation of Outward Ceremonies . . . . .             | 129     |
| VI. Abrogation of the Outward Temple . . . . .            | 133     |
| VII. Discourse with the Samaritan Woman . . . . .         | 148     |
| VIII. John's Testimony of Jesus . . . . .                 | 153     |
| IX. Jesus at Simon's House, and the Sinner . . . . .      | 155     |
| X. Parable of the Publican and Pharisee . . . . .         | 158     |
| XI. Parable of the New Garment and the New Wine . . . . . | 159     |
| XII. The Preaching of Christ . . . . .                    | 160     |
| XIII. Recapitulation . . . . .                            | 162     |

## CHAPTER III

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| THE KINGDOM OF GOD . . . . .                         | 173-232 |
| I. The Testimony of Jesus concerning John . . . . .  | 178     |
| II. Conviction of the Cities . . . . .               | 180     |
| III. Coming of the Kingdom of God . . . . .          | 182     |
| IV. Discourse with Nicodemus . . . . .               | 183     |
| V. Meaning of the Discourse with Nicodemus . . . . . | 197     |
| VI. Parable of the Sower and the Seed . . . . .      | 205     |
| VII. Parable of the Leaven . . . . .                 | 210     |
| VIII. Parable of the Wheat and Tares . . . . .       | 210     |
| IX. Parable of the Fishing-Net . . . . .             | 215     |
| X. Explanation of the Parable of the Sower . . . . . | 219     |
| XI. Parable of the Treasure . . . . .                | 223     |
| XII. Parable of the Mustard Seed . . . . .           | 223     |
| XIII. Recapitulation . . . . .                       | 224     |

CHAPTER IV

|  | PAGE    |
|--|---------|
| THE LAW : SERMON ON THE MOUNT . . . . .                          | 233-360 |
| I. Rich and Poor . . . . .                                       | 233     |
| II. The Salt of the Earth, the Light of the World . . . . .      | 246     |
| III. The Everlasting Law . . . . .                               | 255     |
| IV. The First Commandment : Be not Angry . . . . .               | 266     |
| V. The Second Commandment : Committ not Fornication . . . . .    | 272     |
| VI. The Third Commandment : Do not Swear . . . . .               | 277     |
| VII. The Fourth Commandment : Resist not Evil . . . . .          | 285     |
| VIII. The Fifth Commandment : Do not War . . . . .               | 307     |
| IX. Of Alms-giving, Fasting, and Praying . . . . .               | 318     |
| X. Of taking Thought for the Future . . . . .                    | 334     |
| XI. The Narrow Path . . . . .                                    | 346     |
| XII. Parable of the House built on a Rock, and on Sand . . . . . | 347     |
| XIII. Election of the Twelve Apostles . . . . .                  | 348     |
| XIV. Recapitulation . . . . .                                    | 349     |
| GREEK INDEX . . . . .  | 361     |
| INDEX TO BIBLICAL REFERENCES . . . . .                           | 365     |





## PREFACE

---

*REASON* Without faith had already brought me to despair and to a denial of life, but when I once really examined into the life of humanity, I became convinced that despair cannot be the destiny of men, and that people have lived, and are now living, by faith. I saw around me people who, having this faith, derived from it an idea of life that gave them strength to live and strength to die in peace and in joy. I could not explain to myself by mere reason this idea. I tried to arrange my life after the lives of those who believe, tried to become one with them, to fulfil the same rules of life and laws of conduct, imagining that in this way the idea of life would be revealed to me also. The more closely I came into communion with the people, lived their life, and fulfilled all the outward religious ceremonies they are accustomed to observe, the more strongly I felt two antagonistic forces struggling within me. On the one hand, a full and complete idea of life, which even death cannot destroy, grew upon me; on the other hand, I discovered much that is false in this outward confession and worship of God. I perceived that the people, through their ignorance and want of leisure or inclination for reflection, may be unable to discover what is false; but that it is impossible for me not

to do so, or, having once discovered the falsehood, to shut my eyes to its existence, as many educated believers advised me. The longer I continued to live according to the creed and rites of the believers, the more glaring and patent the falsehood became, and I felt the absolute necessity of finding out where and at what point in their creed falsehood ceases and truth begins. I no longer doubted that the true meaning of life is to be found in the teaching of Christ. My spiritual unrest at last grew so intense that I could not knowingly close my eyes to its existence, as I had done before, but was compelled to inquire into and examine the religious doctrines I wished to adopt.

At first I sought counsel and a solution of my difficulties from priests, monks, bishops, and learned theologians. But I often noticed in them a want of frankness, and still more frequently flagrant self-contradictions in their explanations and interpretations. Moreover, they one and all referred me to holy fathers, to catechisms, and to theology. I accordingly began to study theological works, and the final result of my studies was a conviction that the creed professed and taught by our bishops is neither true nor moral. In the authorised teaching of the Orthodox Church I found nothing concerning life, or its aim and meaning, but a number of dogmas laid down and insisted upon, which reason and common sense must reject, inasmuch as they are altogether incomprehensible and opposed to morality. Nor could I help perceiving that the teaching of theology is directed, not to give us any explanation of the meaning of life, or any instruction concerning life, but simply to maintain a certain number of incomprehensible and unnecessary dogmatic propositions, and to condemn all those who refuse to accept them. The fact that this teaching has for its principal object the condemnation of other creeds naturally

induced me to turn my attention to these other creeds. And these creeds I found to be essentially the same as the orthodox creed that so sharply condemned them. Some, it is true, seemed to be more foolish, and others less absurd; but they all alike affirm incomprehensible propositions that have nothing to do with life; and by their rabid condemnation of one another the brotherhood of men, the cardinal doctrine and the very foundation of Christ's teaching, is practically destroyed.

I was thus brought to the conclusion that there is no Church. All believing Christians alike call themselves true Christians, and deny the title to others. All these separate and distinct sects usurp to themselves the exclusive title of the Church, affirming that theirs is the only true Church, from which the rest have fallen away, whilst they alone have remained faithful to the true creed. Nor is there one of these different sects that has the sense to see that the particular creed they profess is not necessarily the true faith, merely because it has long remained unchanged and unaltered; but that, in reality, they call it the true faith simply because they happen either to have been born within its pale, or to have chosen it for themselves, and that all the other sects claim exactly the same prerogative for their faith. It is therefore evident that there never was, and never can be, one Church; since there are many thousand Churches, each anathematising all the others, and each asserting itself to be the one true Church. Each declares precisely the same thing: "We are the one, true, catholic, holy, apostolic Church; we alone have the true Scriptures; Jesus Christ is the Head of our Church, the Holy Spirit is its guide; and by apostolic succession it has handed down to us the true teaching of Christ."

If we take a branch of ~~the~~ widely-spreading bush, we may

with perfect truth and consistency declare that one branch proceeds from another, that the branches are derived from the trunk, and the trunk from the root, so that each branch springs from one common root; but we cannot make this affirmation exclusively of any one particular branch. For they are all equally the outgrowth of one and the same root. To believe that any one branch is the only true branch were absurd; yet this is what all the Churches assert. For though there are, in truth, many thousand different faiths, each condemns all the others, and each claims to be the one true faith. Catholics, Lutherans, Protestants, Calvinists, Shakers, Mormons, Orthodox Greeks, Old Believers, Sects with Priests, Sects without Priests, Baptists, Gospel-Eunuchs, Spiritual Wrestlers, etc., all make the same claim for their peculiar creed, each placidly assuming that it alone is the true faith, the teaching of the Holy Spirit revealed through Christ, and that all other faiths are heretical and false. And all know that it is so; and each sect, whilst holding up its faith as the only true faith, knows that other sects as like to itself as one crab is like to another, in their turn claim that they alone possess the true faith, and brand every other sect as heretical. For more than eighteen hundred years the Churches have been practising this deception, cheating themselves and others.

In worldly affairs and business matters men are sharp enough to see the cunningest pitfalls laid in their path to entrap them, and will avoid them; but millions of people have for eighteen hundred years and more contentedly gone on with their eyes shut, and allowed themselves to be taken in by this cheat. Nor is this true only of Europe, but even in America, where a new order of things has been established, men, as it were, have agreed to keep on the old lie; and there, too, each petty sect proclaims its own truth.

the one true faith, and coolly ignores the fact that all the other sects do exactly the same thing.

But this is not all. For a long number of years freethinkers have ridiculed this absurdity, and have exercised their wit in exposing the folly of all such claims. They have easily proved that the whole Christian faith, with all its offshoots and branches, has long been played out, and that the time has come for the establishment of a new and fuller faith, and some have even drawn up a programme of the new belief, but no one has cared to listen to them, and men have preferred to keep on believing each in his own particular form of the Christian faith. Thus Catholics, Lutherans, Dissidents, Mormons, and the Orthodox Church of Russia, in which I thought to find salvation, one and all have persisted in their adherence to the old creed. How is this to be explained? Why do not men throw off the old teaching? To this question there is but one answer. The teaching of Christ is good for men, without which it were impossible for them to live, and therefore dear to them. But it may be asked, why have those who believe in the teaching of Christ split themselves up into different sects, the number of sects increasing every year, and why do they so loudly and so clamorously judge and condemn each other, instead of uniting in one common creed? The answer to this is equally simple and plain. The cause of dissension and schism among Christians is the doctrine concerning the Church, according to which Christ established one true Church, that from its very nature is holy and infallible, and whose mission it is to teach others. Were it not for this doctrine concerning the Church, there could be no dissension among Christians. Each Christian Church, that is, each Christian confession, is undoubtedly an outcome of the teaching of Christ; but not one of them is the only outcome, and all the

confessions have the same basis and foundation. They all have grown up from the same seed, and that which unites them and is common to them all is this seed from which they have sprung. And therefore to understand aright the teaching of Christ, it is not necessary to learn it by trying to trace it backward from the branch to the trunk, nor is it either necessary or profitable to study it scientifically, that is, to trace it upward from its foundation, from the trunk to its branches. In neither of these ways can we obtain a true idea of the teaching of Christ. This idea can only be gained by a knowledge of that same seed from which they all spring, and that same fruit, to produce which they all live. They have all sprung from the life and acts of Christ, and they all live to reproduce the acts of Christ, that is, to produce good works. And only in such works does the bond of real unity consist.

It was my search after the meaning of life, my endeavour to discover the path of life, how to live, that brought me to the faith. And when I saw the rich fruits the lives of those professing the teaching of Christ bore, I joined myself to them. And such people who carried out in the works of their lives the teaching of Christ, I found both among orthodox believers and among Catholics, Lutherans, and Dissenters of every sect, from which it is evident that the general idea of life, as laid down by the teaching of Christ, is not to be found in the dogmas of any particular confession, but in something that is common to all confessions. I found good people, not in one, but in all Churches and sects, and saw how they were all guided in their lives by one and the same idea, that had its foundation in the teaching of Christ. I found all these different sects to be united in their belief as to what is good, what is evil, and how we must live. And they all declared this belief to be the

teaching of Christ. However their creeds might differ, they had one and the same basis, and accordingly it is in that common basis we can alone find the truth. It is this truth I now wish to discover. And this truth will be found, not in those dogmatic interpretations of Christ's revelation that have divided Christians into so many thousand sects, but rather in the very first revelation of Christ himself. This first revelation—the words of Christ himself—is to be found in the Gospels. And it was for this reason I began to study the Gospels.

I know that, according to the teaching of the Church, the meaning of Christ's words is to be found, not in the Gospels alone, but in the writings and traditions preserved and handed down to us by the Church. But, I presume, after what has been already said, this sophistical idea that the Scriptures, which serve as the foundation of my creed, must not be studied and examined, because their true interpretation belongs to the Church alone, can have no authority or influence with reasonable men; the more so, as the interpretation favoured by one Church is entirely different to the interpretation sanctioned by the other Churches, and all the holy Churches contradict and condemn one another. And if the Church forbids us to read and to explain the Scriptures for ourselves, it is only a proof that the Church feels uneasy as to the truth of its own interpretation.

God has revealed his truth to man. I am a man, and have, therefore, not only the right, but am bound to avail myself of his revelation, and to receive it direct from him, without the interference of any intermediate agent. If it be God who speaks in these books, he knows the weakness of my understanding, and will speak to me in such a way that his words cannot lead me into error. The argument that the Church cannot allow individuals to interpret the Scrip-



tures for themselves lest they should fall into error, is an unauthorised assumption that can have neither sense nor meaning for me. It could only have sense or meaning, not the interpretation authorised by the Church an intelligible interpretation, or if there were but one Church and therefore but one interpretation. But as it is, the dogmatic teaching of the Church about the Son of God, a God who is three in one and one in three, a virgin who gives birth to a child without losing her virginity, the body and blood of God which is eaten and drunk under the shape of bread and wine,—these and such like doctrines outrage common sense, and even if we could accept one interpretation, it is simply impossible to accept a thousand conflicting and contradictory interpretations. On the contrary, what we require, and what we must have, is an interpretation which all will agree to accept. And this agreement can only be ensured when the interpretation is both reasonable and intelligible. In spite of unessential differences, we shall all agree to accept what is reasonable. If the revelation be a true revelation, it will not fear the light of reason, but will court inquiry and investigation. But if the revelation be manifestly foolish and incomprehensible, it is better for us to have nothing to do with it. It is true, God is omnipotent; but there is one thing he cannot do, and that is, talk foolishly. And to give men a revelation which it is impossible for them to understand, would be to talk foolishly.

By revelation I understand that which discovers to the human reason something transcending its highest powers. It is the will of God, a truth beyond the unaided attainment of reason. I call that revelation which gives an answer to the question, What meaning has life?—a question which we cannot solve, and the inability to answer which brings us to the

to despair, and tempted me to commit suicide. The answer given by revelation must be intelligible and not contrary to the laws of reason, as would be, for example, the assertion that an infinite number is an equal, or an unequal, number. The answer must not be in conflict with reason, because I can have no faith in such an answer; and it must therefore be neither unintelligible nor arbitrary, but an answer as necessarily acceptable to the human understanding as the conception of infinity is recognised and acknowledged by every man who is able to count.

The answer must solve my question, What meaning has my life? If it does not answer that question, I have no need of it at all. The answer must be such that, though in its essential nature unattainable, even as God is unattainable, none the less all the logical deductions drawn from it respond to my reasonable demand that the meaning given to my life solve all the problems of my life. The answer must be not only rational and clear, but also true; that is, an answer in which I believe with all my soul, and in the truth of which I am compelled to believe, even as I am obliged to believe in the existence of infinity.

Revelation cannot be founded on what the Church understands by faith; that is, belief in something that is to be told me. Faith is the result of the incontrovertible truthfulness of a revelation that completely satisfies the understanding.

Faith, according to the teaching of the Church, is something enforced on the soul of man by promises of a reward if he consents beforehand to believe, and threatenings of punishment if he refuses to believe.

As I understand it, faith is the belief that the foundation on which every act of the understanding is based is a true foundation. Faith is the knowledge of a revelation,

without which it is impossible to live and to think. Revelation discovers to us what man by his mere reason cannot attain to ; but at the same time, makes known so much as mankind can comprehend of the origin of all things hidden in infinity. Such, in my opinion, must be the nature of a revelation capable of provoking faith, and it is a revelation of this kind I look for in the words of Christ ; and I therefore turn to them with the expectation that they will satisfy the strictest requirements of a rational and critical investigation.

I do not read the Old Testament, because the question is, not what was the faith of the Jews, but in what consists the faith of Christ, wherein men find a meaning that enables them to live. The Hebrew Scriptures may be employed to explain to us the form in which Christianity was first expressed ; but we cannot recognise the continued descent of faith from the days of Adam to our own time, since down to the age of Christ the faith of the Jews was local and national. The faith of the Jews is for us a foreign faith, and can interest us only in the same way as, for example, the faith of the Brahmins. The Christian faith is the faith by which we live. To study the faith of the Jews in order to understand Christianity, is as though we were to study the quality of a candle before it is lighted, in order to understand the nature of the light that proceeds from the candle when burning. All that we can say on this point is that the quality and character of the light may depend on the character and quality of the candle, just as the form in which the teaching of the New Testament is conveyed may depend on its connection with Judaism ; but the light it can give us is no explanation why it is produced by this, and not by that candle. The mistake made by the Church in claiming for the books of the Old Testament the same kind

of inspiration it claims for those of the New Testament, is made patent to the dullist intelligence by the fact that the claim, though made in words, has never been made in reality, and has further led the Church into flagrant self-contradictions, from which it never could have freed itself, supposing a Church ever judged it necessary to be bound by the laws of common sense. And therefore I put aside the writings of the Old Testament, consisting of twenty-seven books, all of which, according to the Church, are inspired works. In fealty this traditional claim to inspiration, if once accepted, cannot be limited to twenty-seven or to any particular number of books, since God's revelation is not to be counted by pages and letters.

To assert that God's revelation is confined within a hundred and eighty-five pages is the same as to assert that the soul of a particular individual weighs six hundred pounds, or that the light from a lamp is equal to that of seven candles, four to a pound.

Revelation found its first expression in the souls of men, and they transmitted its message to others, who in their turn wrote it down. Among these writings we know that there are more than a hundred Gospels and Epistles which have never been recognised and accepted by the Church. From among them all the Church chose twenty-seven books, and declared them to be canonical. But it need scarcely be said that in some of these books the old traditions are better and more accurately recorded than in the others. The Church was therefore obliged to draw a separating line, and to mark off the books which it claimed to be inspired. It is, however, plain that the Church could never draw a strict line of demarcation between the absolutely true and the absolutely false. Tradition shades off from white to black, from truth to falsehood; and wherever the line was to be

drawn, it was necessary that it should mark off sharply the black from the white. And this is what the Church did when it detached tradition by calling certain books canonical and others apocryphal. We cannot but admire the delucacy and skill with which the Church fulfilled its task. \* The Church has made its selection so well that the newest critics are agreed that no addition can be made to the canon. The more we criticise and examine, the more convinced we must be that all that is trustworthy and necessary is included in the canonised books of the Church.

Nor is this all. As if to correct the mistake into which it could not but fall when attempting to draw the line between truth and tradition, the Church gave its sanction to some of the traditions contained in the apocryphal books.

All that could be done was done admirably. But in making its selection of books the Church committed one great fault. Wishing to give greater force to its rejection of the books it refused to acknowledge, and at the same time greater authority to those it accepted, the Church declared all the canonical books to be infallible. They were all affirmed to have been inspired by the Holy Spirit, and their every word was guaranteed to be true. By this gratuitous assumption the Church only harmed and undermined the credit of the books it accepted. By comprehending in one and the same sphere of tradition both the white, the bright, and the grey, that is, doctrines more or less pure, and stamping it all with the seal of infallibility, the Church deprived itself of the right to harmonise the Scriptures, to exclude the untrue, or to explain and interpret the sacred books, to do what is its bounden duty. But thus the Church has never done.

All in those books is declared to be equally holy and sacred: the miracles, the Acts of the Apostles, the opinion of Paul as to the use of wine, or the ravings of the writers of the

*Apocalypse* The consequence is that, though written some eighteen hundred years ago, these books still lie before us in the same rude unharmonised faulty, and contradictory form as when they were first edited. Having once declared that every word of the Scriptures is holy truth, the Church has tried to bring into accord, to explain away, and to clear up flagrant contradictions: it has done all it could to give something like a meaning to what in reality is without sense or meaning. But the first mistake was a fatal one. For having declared all to be holy truth it was necessary to justify all in these books as if in so doing the Church fell into irreconcilable contradictions and, next of all, not seldom taught what is untrue. But though in theory the Church accepted all, it was in reality obliged to reject some of the books. Such books as the *Apocalypse* in its entirety, and the *Acts of the Apostles* in part contain much that is not only unedifying but much that is directly pernicious. There is no doubt that Luke introduced into his narrative a number of miracles with the aim of confirming the faith of his hearers, and we may suppose many to have been strengthened in faith by reading his book, but it is impossible to name a work more calculated to undermine the faith of a modern reader. A candle may be necessary and useful when it is dark. But where there is light we have no need of a candle to see the light. The Christian miracles are like a candle which men put into our hands that we may see the light. If there be light, the light is visible in itself and of itself, but if there be no light, then it is the candle brought in that alone gives light.

To read these twenty-seven books from the first to the last, taking every word to be holy truth, as the Church reads them, is, then, useless, and even harmful, and can only lead us to what it has already led the Church, to a denial of

reason and common sense. In order to understand what is written in the Scriptures, and its application to the Christian faith, we must first of all ask ourselves which of the twenty-seven books claiming to be Holy Scripture are most essential and important, and then begin our study with the more important ones. There can be no doubt that the four Gospels belong to this class. All the sacred books written before them may be regarded as historical helps for comprehending the Gospels, all written after them are but explanations of the Gospels. And therefore it is not necessary, as the Churches vainly try to do, to bring all these books into harmony and agreement; indeed, I am convinced that the attempt to do this has, more than anything else, caused the Church to preach incomprehensible dogmas. All we have to do is to select from these four Gospels, which the Church rightly teaches us contain the highest and most essential revealed truths, the fundamental principles of Christ's teaching, without endeavouring to bring them into unison with the other books. And if I do not attempt this, it is not because I do not wish such harmony to be demonstrated, but because I fear being led incautiously to adopt some of those errors with which the other books abound.

I have to seek in these books, first, what is intelligible to me, because no one can believe what is unintelligible to him, and unintelligible knowledge is nothing better than ignorance; secondly, I have to find in them an answer to my question, What am I, and what is God? and, thirdly, I have to discover in them the one central foundation of all revelation. And therefore those portions which are wholly or partially unintelligible I read, not with the desire to get them to agree with preconceived ideas, but with the desire of making them agree with those portions that are perfectly clear, and with the one elementary underlying doctrine.

reading the Scriptures and what has been written about them, not once but many times, I have come to the conclusion that all Christian teaching is to be found in the four Gospels, and that the books of the Old Testament can only serve as materials for an explanation of the form which the teaching of Christ took, but, if studied with any other purpose, will only obscure and pervert its meaning. In the Epistles of John and James, which were written to clear up the difficulties of certain individual believers, we may find the teachings of Christ treated from a fresh point of view, but we shall find nothing new in them. Unfortunately, in these Epistles, and still oftener in those of Paul, we come across expressions and glosses that may easily mislead the reader, and even give a false meaning to the words of Christ. The Acts of the Apostles, as also several of the Epistles of Paul, not only have nothing in common with the Gospels and the Epistles of Peter, John, and James, but are often in flag contradiction to them. The Apocalypse, though called the Book of Revelations, in reality reveals nothing. The most important thing for us is that the Gospels, though written at different periods, form a complete exposition of Christ's teaching; and all the other books are merely explanations of them. I have read the Scriptures in Greek and in the version authorised by the Russian Church, and have myself retranslated them, here and there departing from the translations already existing when the Church first authoritatively fixed the canon; my aim having been to give the general meaning, and at the same time adhere to the strict meaning of the original. The more I studied the Gospels, the more I perceived the necessity of harmonising the four Gospels into one, since they all relate, though from different standpoints, the same events, and they all set forth the same doctrine. The new theory of our modern exegetists,



that the Gospel according to John is essentially a theological work, and should therefore be treated apart, does not concern me, since my task is, not to write an historical, a philosophical, or a theological commentary, but to discover the meaning of Christ's teaching. This is set forth in all the four Gospels, and consequently, if they all set forth one and the same revealed truth, each will be found to confirm and explain the other three. And therefore, in my study of these books, I have always sought to make one common Gospel out of the four Gospels, including in this way the Gospel according to John. Many attempts have already been made to harmonise the Gospels, but the writers I am acquainted with, such as Arnulfo de Vence, Reuss, Farrar, Grechoulevitch, have all adopted the historical method. Not to one of them do I think the preference can be given, so far as their historical treatment of the subject is concerned, and they may all be deemed equally satisfactory as doctrinal expositors. For my own part, I have completely refrained from touching on the historical signification of the Gospels, and have confined myself entirely to their doctrinal teaching. By making this the basis of our method of harmonising the Gospels, we secure one great advantage in being able to regard their teaching as a circle, all the parts of which equally define one another, so that it is quite immaterial from which point we start. In adopting this mode of studying the Gospels, in which the historical events in the life of Christ are so intimately connected with his teaching, historical sequence seemed to me to be a thing of no importance, and for this reason it was immaterial to me what version of the Gospels I selected as the basis of my inquiry. I first chose two of the newest versions, those by Grechoulevitch and Reuss, both of whom have availed themselves of the labours of their predecessors; 1.

has excluded John from the synoptic Gospels, I found Grechoulavitch's version more suitable for my purpose, and therefore selected his as the foundation of my work. I have throughout collated his version with that of Reuss, and have rejected both whenever I believed the meaning and bearing of the original Gospels justified me in so doing.



## • INTRODUCTION

### 1. THE ANNUNCIATION OF TRUE HAPPINESS MADE BY JESUS CHRIST

Εὐαγγέλιον<sup>1</sup> κατὰ Ματθαίου.<sup>2</sup>  
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον.  
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν.  
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην.

The annunciation of true happiness according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John.

Mark i. 1 : Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου  
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>3</sup> υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>4</sup>

The beginning of the annunciation of true happiness made by Jesus Christ, son of God.

1. The word εὐαγγέλιον, applied exclusively to the books of the New Testament, is made up of the two words εὖ and ἀγγέλιον. *Εὖ* signifies *well, good, truly*; ἀγγέλιον signifies, not so much the announcement made, as the act itself of announcing; and the whole word is therefore to be translated, *annunciation of true happiness*.

2. The words κατὰ Ματθαῖον, etc., show that the annunciation of true happiness was made known *after*, or *according to*, the verbal or written narrative, or *according to information* or traditions communicated by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; and as it is quite uncertain in what way the evangelists themselves transmitted their testimony, and it is not said that they themselves wrote

these books, the preposition *κατά* must be translated *according to*. In whatever way they were originally composed, the subject-matter of these books was communicated by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John.

3. The word *Χριστός* signifies *The Anointed One*, and has its origin in the Jewish ceremonial law. But so far as the subject-matter of the annunciation is concerned, the word is of no importance, and may be rendered indifferently, *The Anointed One*, or Christ. I prefer the latter interpretation, since the phrase *Anointed One* has in our Church language acquired another and narrower meaning.

4. The name or title *Son of God* has been given by the Church exclusively to Jesus Christ; but it is never used in the Gospels in this restricted sense, being applied indiscriminately to all human creatures. Thus, when speaking to a multitude of people, Jesus Christ says—

Matt. v. 16: Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify *your heavenly Father*.

Matt. v. 45: Be ye sons of *your heavenly Father*: for he lets his sun rise on the good and on the evil, and he lets his rain fall on the righteous and the unrighteous.

Luke vi. 36: Be ye merciful, even as *your Father* is merciful

Matt. vi. 1: Take heed that you give not *your* alms before men, that they may see you: for so *you* shall receive no reward from *your heavenly Father*.

Matt. vi. 4: Let thine alms be given in secret, and *thy Father*, who sees in secret, shall reward thee.

Matt. v. 48: Be therefore perfect, even as *your heavenly Father* is perfect.

Matt. vi. 6: But thou, when thou prayest, retire into thy room, and, having shut thy door, pray to *thy Father* in secret; and *thy Father*, who sees in secret, shall reward thee openly.

Matt. vi. 8: Be not like unto them: for *your Father* knows whereof you have need, even before you ask him.

Matt. vi. 14: For if you forgive men their trespasses, even so will *your heavenly Father* forgive you.

There are numerous other passages in the Gospels in which men are named sons of God. But more than this, in the Gospel according to Luke we find a passage from which we can learn that not only are all human creatures to be comprehended in this term, sons of God, but that Jesus Christ himself was son of God, not in any exceptional signification of the term, but simply because, like all other creatures, he came from God, and was therefore son of God. In this passage (iii. 38) Luke is tracing the lineage of Jesus by the mother's side, and expressly tells us that Jesus was the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God. And thus the words, *Jesus Christ, son of God*, designate the person by whom the annunciation is made. This person is named, as he was called by people, *Jesus*; besides which he is entitled *the Christ*, that is, *the chosen of God*, and also *son of God*.

This title defines the subject of the book. It tells us that in the book we shall find the annunciation of true human happiness. It is necessary to keep this title well in mind, that we may be able to distinguish the more essential from the less important parts of the book; for, since the subject of the book is the annunciation of true

human happiness, all that defines this happiness forms a portion of the annunciation itself, and all the rest, which is not written with that direct intention, is less essential.

And so the full title of the book will be—

“The annunciation of true happiness made by Jesus Christ, son of God.”

## II. OBJECT WITH WHICH THE GOSPELS WERE WRITTEN.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>John xx. 31 : Ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, ἵνα πιστεύσῃτε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ,<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.<sup>2</sup></p> | <p>This has been written, that you may believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God ; and, believing this, may obtain life through his being the son of God.</p> |
|---|---|

1. In many texts, instead of ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, we read, ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. I prefer the second reading as being more intelligible.

2. The literal translation of the words, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, *in his name*, is an example of the many phrases to which, whilst translating them literally, we give an arbitrary and very often unintelligible signification. The Hebrew word answering to ὄνομα signifies not a name, but the person himself ; the individual ; that which he is ; and therefore the phrase, *have life in his name*, must be understood to mean, that life is given through and by the entity of him who is son of God.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Luke i. 1 : Ὡς ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπιχειρήσαντες ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν</p> | <p>Inasmuch as many have undertaken to relate</p> |
|--|---|

περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν  
πραγμάτων,

things that have taken place  
amongst us,

2: Καθὼς παρέδουσιν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.<sup>1</sup>

As eye-witnesses and ministers  
of the teaching have handed  
them down to us.

3: Ἐδοξεν καὶ μοι, παρηκολούθησάν με ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἰς τέλος, σοὶ γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε·

It has been good to me, since  
I have known all these things  
from the beginning, to write fully  
of them, excellent Theophilus ;

4: ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατήχηθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

In order that you may know  
the very truth concerning those  
doctrines wherein you have been  
instructed.

• 1. The words, αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, have been incorrectly translated in the Slavonic Version, *eye-witnesses and servants of the Word*; and in the German Version, *Diener des Wortes*. Λόγου in this sentence cannot mean *word*, for we cannot be eye-witnesses of a word. The translation in the Vulgate, *viderunt et ministri sermonis*, is more correct. Here the word λόγου cannot signify anything else than *the preaching of the doctrine, or of wisdom*.

2. The introduction to the Gospel according to Luke is addressed personally to Theophilus, and, of course, does not come within the doctrinal portion of the book.

In the preface it is said that men will have life through their belief that Jesus Christ was son of God. Just as by the words, *annunciation of happiness*, a particular and higher happiness is meant than people ordinarily understand by that word, so by the term



life we must evidently understand something different to what is generally called life. This other life is gained through the belief that there is a son of God, and we thus learn how closely the annunciation itself of happiness is connected with the sonship to God.

The verses in which Luke speaks of those who wrote before him, and of the reason why he thought it well to compose his own narrative, have nothing to do with the doctrinal portion of the book, and may therefore be omitted in my exposition, or, if included, must be regarded of secondary importance.

And so the full meaning of these verses from Luke will be—

“This annunciation of true happiness has been written; that all who believe that Jesus Christ was son of God may obtain life through the belief that there is a son of God.”

### III. THE INTELLIGENCE OF LIFE

John 1 1 'Εν ἰσχυρῇ ᾤ, ὁ | The beginning of all things was  
λογος.<sup>4</sup> | made the intelligence of life.

In order to understand the necessity of explaining the first and following verses of the first chapter of John's Gospel, we must have a clear idea of the worth of the ordinarily accepted version. The orthodox version of the first verse gives no meaning whatever. *The beginning was the Word.* This is no translation of the idea, but of the words. It gives no meaning, and each separate word has to be understood in a vague and arbitrary sense. To discover the true significance

of these terms, we must discard altogether the Church's gloss, and analyse each word.

1. The preposition ἐν signifies *residence in something*; with a verb of motion it signifies *transposition and residence in something*.

2. Ἀρχή signifies, not only a *definite and radical commencement*, but also *the formation of all things*; and, therefore, I translate the word, *the beginning of all things*.

3. Ἦν, from the verb εἶμι, signifies, not only *existence*, but also *change*; and may, indeed must, often be translated, *was made, became*.

4. Λόγος has eleven different meanings: (1) *a word*; (2) *a discourse*; (3) *a conversation*; (4) *a report*; (5) *eloquence*; (6) *reason, the faculty by which men are distinguished from animals*; (7) *reasoning, an opinion, a doctrine* (the same as *sermo* in the Vulgate); (8) *an antecedent cause, the ground for thinking*; (9) *an account*; (10) *respect, esteem*; (11) *relation* (λόγος ἐγένετο πρὸς), *to be in relation with someone*. Give a pupil, who knows Greek but is ignorant of the teaching of the Church, this first verse of John's Gospel to translate, and, if he wants to make an intelligible translation of the passage, he will reject all but the sixth, seventh, eighth, and eleventh of these renderings, since not one of them harmonises with what follows. The remaining four terms, if used as equivalents for the word λόγος, are suited to render the meaning of the original sentence; but none of them taken separately is adequate or sufficient.

*Reason* is the faculty by which men think.

*Reasoning* is this faculty in action.

*Correlation* is that which gives material for reasoning.

*Cause* is one of the forms of thought.

Each of these terms defines one particular point in the act of thinking. *Λόγος* is evidently used in this passage in the widest and most general signification. I have preferred to translate the word *λόγος* by the term *intelligence*, because it combines all the four significations of the word *λόγος*. This translation is, moreover, justified by the expression made use of by the same writer in the opening lines of the First Epistle of John, where we read, *περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς*. Now it is evident this can only be translated, *concerning the intelligence of the life*. By adding these words, *τῆς ζωῆς*, the writer has made his meaning clear and definite. And this is why I have translated the word *λόγος*, *intelligence*, because I find such a translation to be precise and clear; but I do not reject the other translations. Whether we employ the word *reason*, or *wisdom*, or even the term *word* in its widest signification, or whether we leave the word *λογος* altogether untranslated, the meaning of the passage will remain the same.

And so I translate the first sentence of the first verse thus—

“The beginning of all things was made the intelligence of life.”

This gives us an intelligible meaning of the idea which we bear in mind the title, the annunciation of true happiness made by Jesus Christ—

"The intelligence of life was made the beginning of all things through the annunciation of Jesus Christ."

John i. 1: <sup>1</sup> Καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς <sup>2</sup> | And the intelligence of life  
τὸν θεόν. | took the place of God.

1. In the orthodox version, the second sentence of this verse is still more hopelessly unintelligible than the first. If we would discover its meaning, we must first turn our attention to the word *God*. The word *God* serves as a definition of what the *logos* is. It is therefore necessary to know what the author understands by the word *God*. This is indicated to us in the eighteenth verse of this same chapter, and in the First Epistle of John (iv. 12) it is said: "No man has at any time seen God." In order that the reader may not attribute to the word *God* an idea which the writer does not connect with it, we must remember how the writer understands this word. Only by definitely showing what we are to understand, and what we are not to understand, by the word *God*, can we make clear the meaning of these first verses.

2. The preposition *πρὸς* with the accusative signifies: (1) *to*; (2) *towards*; (3) *near, in, on, besides, more than* (with dative); (4) *for, on account of*; (5) *in reference to*; (6) *in comparison with*; (7) *on a level with, in relation to*; (8) *against, opposite*; (9) *on occasion*; (10) *at the time of*; (11) *nearly, about*. Its original and simplest meaning is *to*.

3. If we translate the words, *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, literally, *to God*, they will have no meaning. They will be equally

meaningless if translated, *with God*, *apud Deum*, *bei Gott*; and this translation is further faulty, inasmuch as the preposition *πρός* with an accusative never means *apud*; and I have purposely transcribed all the meanings of *πρός* followed by an accusative, to show that it can never be translated by the word *with*. *Apud* signifies *before*, *at*, *near*, *by the side of*. The only justification for this translation is that *πρός* with the accusative, though very rarely, signifies the same as it does with the dative, *near*, *by the side of*, and *apud* has also sometimes this meaning. But, passing over the fact that in a thousand cases *πρός* will not more than once bear the meaning of *near*, *by the side of*: even if we allow that *πρός* in this passage signifies *apud*, the meaning of the whole proposition will be, the λόγος was *near God*, and not *with God*. And if we adopt the orthodox translation, there is no other way of getting out of the difficulty.

The orthodox translation, *with God*, has received a mystic interpretation, and the Church has adopted it, quite forgetting that this is not so much a translation as a gloss upon the passage. But as I always try to find some meaning in the book I happen to be reading, I cannot allow myself to give words an arbitrary meaning, and consequently must either reject these words as being altogether unintelligible, or find a meaning for them that will not violate the laws of the Greek language, and will at the same time be conformable to common sense. In order to make the whole sentence intelligible, we may understand λόγος in the sense of *word* or *wisdom*, and give to the preposition *πρός* the meaning it often has in Greek, *relative to*, *in relation to*. In this way, we may here simply translate *πρός* by the genitive case, without any preposition: "And the intelligence of life began to be

intelligence of God." But if we adopt this translation, the natural meaning of the preposition *πρός* is lost. But we may give to the word *λόγος* the meaning of *reasoning* (reason in action), which is always directed to something, and then the preposition *πρός* can be translated in its first and direct signification, *to*; and we shall translate the sentence thus: "Reasoning was, or began to be, directed to God." In this case we have to add the word *directed*; for otherwise our translation will have no meaning. But we may also give to the word *πρός* the idea of equality, the exchange of one thing by another. This signification we generally express by the word *like*, *equally*, or *in comparison with*. Thus we say: "Oxen do not work like (equally with) horses." "He reverences him like (equally with) a father." "In this town there is good equally with all other towns." And then the third translation of the verse will be: "The beginning of all things was intelligence of life, and intelligence of life took the place of (became like) God."

The first two translations have nearly one and the same meaning, but they are neither of them quite accurate. In the first, the meaning of the words *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, which are twice repeated, and are therefore evidently necessary to express the idea, is ignored; and in the second, to find a meaning for the preposition *πρός*, a new word, *directed*, is arbitrarily introduced.

The third translation expresses the same idea, and has the advantage of rendering *πρός* by means of a corresponding preposition, and does not add anything to the original.

A careful examination and analysis of these four propositions, in which we have the same preposition *πρός*, will enable us to decide which of them is to be preferred. The four propositions are the following:—

1. In the beginning was the λόγος; or, The λόγος was made the beginning.

2. The λόγος was directed to God; or The λόγος became directed to God.

3. The λόγος was God; or, The λόγος became God.

4. In the beginning the λόγος was πρὸς τὸν θεόν; or, The beginning was the λόγος πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

In all the three translations, one portion of the idea is clear and the other portion not clear. Thus, the first proposition is clear. "In the beginning was, or, the beginning was, or, the beginning was made, the intelligence of life." The third is equally clear: "The intelligence of life was, or became, God."

All the three translations, and the orthodox translation, agree with the idea conveyed in the first proposition: that in the beginning was the intelligence of life, or, the beginning was made the intelligence of life, and with the idea conveyed in the third proposition: that the intelligence of life was, or became, God.

The leading idea, then, is this: "In the beginning was, or, the beginning was made, the intelligence of life, and it was, or became, God." And the second statement is a necessary deduction from the first.

The second proposition explains this idea, in what way the intelligence of life was, or became, God; and the fourth proposition simply repeats the first and second. It is said that it became God by being directed to God. The three significations of πρὸς bring us to the same conclusion. "The intelligence of life was, or became, the intelligence of God." "It was, or became, directed to God." "It was, or became, equal to, or took the place of God."

The first two translations come to one and the same thing, namely, that intelligence is that which appears

God. "The intelligence of life was the intelligence of God," means: "The intelligence of life expresses God." "The intelligence of life was directed to God, and became God," also means: "The intelligence of life mingled with God, expressed God." And this translation includes the idea conveyed by the other first two translations. We have only to substitute for the somewhat awkward expression, *equally with*, the word, *in place of*, and we at once get a full, comprehensive, and literal translation, in which we even preserve the grammatical cases of the original: "And the intelligence of life took the place of God."

John i. 1: Καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.<sup>1</sup> And the intelligence of life became God.

2. Οὗτος ἦν<sup>2</sup> ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς θεόν. It became the beginning of all things in place of God.

1. According to the construction of the Greek language, λόγος is the subject of the verb ἦν, because the article ὁ stands before it, and θεός is the predicate, because it has no article before it.

2. The verb εἶναι, besides signifying *to be*, *to live*, *to exist*, also means *to proceed from*, *to be made*, *to become*. If it is said that in the beginning was the intelligence of life, the λόγος; and it is further said that it was directed to God, or, was with God, or, was in place of God; we cannot possibly affirm that it was God. For if it be God, it cannot be in any relation to him. And therefore in this place we must translate ἦν, not by the word *was*, but by the word *became*. And the two verses thus translated will have a definite meaning. The idea of God is presupposed, and only the source of that by the



here spoken of. We are thus here told that, according to the annunciation made by Jesus Christ, the intelligence of life became the beginning of all things. And the intelligence of life, according to the teaching of Jesus Christ, replaced the idea of God, or became one with it.

If it were necessary to adduce any argument in favour of this interpretation of these two verses, we might refer to the eighteenth verse, which directly affirms that no one has known God, but that the son was made manifest in the λόγος: as well as to the following verses, in which we are told that all was born of the λόγος, and that without the λόγος nothing was born. This and the subsequent development of the idea all supports the same interpretation.

And so the meaning of these two verses will be—

“According to the annunciation of true happiness made by Jesus Christ, the intelligence of life is the foundation and beginning of all things. The intelligence of life took the place of God, and became God. And this, according to the annunciation of Jesus Christ, became the foundation and beginning of all things, in place of God.”

John i. 3 Παντα δι' αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup> | And all was begotten through  
 ἐγένετο,<sup>2</sup> καὶ χωρὶς<sup>3</sup> αὐτοῦ<sup>4</sup> ἐγένετο | intelligence of life, and without  
 οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ οὐ γέγονεν<sup>5</sup> | intelligence of life was nothing  
 | begotten of that which was born  
 | and lives

1. The words δι' αὐτοῦ signify by means of it, through it, and cannot be translated by the ablative case. δι' does not mean by itself, but through, or by means of. We therefore so translated it, and replaced the word thing, if the word for which it is substituted.

2. In its original and simple signification, the word *ἐγένετο* means *was begotten*. The lexicons give the five following renderings of *γίγνεσθαι*: (1) *to be born*; (2) *to become*; (3) *to be, to exist*; (4) *to be often*; (5) *to be busied with something*. The verb has no other signification. It does not admit of being translated, as in the Vulgate, by the words *facta sunt*, or, as in Luther's Bible, by the word *gemacht*. In the Vulgate we read, *omnia per ipsum facta sunt*, and in Luther's Bible, *alle Dinge sind durch dasselbe gemacht*. In the Slavonic Version it is translated *to be*; but owing to the implied explanation in the immediately following phrase, that all was created by him, the word *to be* is understood in the same sense as *facta* in the Vulgate, and *gemacht* in Luther's Bible, that is to say, in the sense of *created*. I translate the word in its original simple meaning, in which is included the idea of *to become* and *to be*. There is no need to justify my departure from the ordinary versions; on the contrary, these earlier translators are bound to give a reason for their departure from the original. No justification can be offered for this arbitrary translation of the word *ἐγένετο* by *facta sunt* and *gemacht*; but an explanation can be found in the interpretation given to the passage by the Church. According to the Church interpretation, the *λόγος* is the second Person in the Trinity, to whom is attributed the creation of the world. And, consequently, in the Vulgate *γίγνομαι* is translated into Latin by *fit*, though the two verbs do not at all correspond. In Luther's Bible, the participle *gemacht*, which corresponds with one of the meanings of *fit*, when used actively, is employed in a sense entirely different to that of the word employed in the original.

The following is the gloss put on this passage by the

Archimandrite Michael in his *Commentary on the Four Gospels* —

"All is derived through Him all has derived its existence through Him, all has been created by Him (John 1:3) The Apostle Paul developing this idea of the creation of everything by the Word, thus explains the signification of *all* All that is in the heavens, all that is on the earth, all that is visible and invisible, principalities powers, dominions, authorities, all is created by Him and for Him (Col 1:16) This means that in the whole sphere of created things, neither in the heavens nor on the earth, neither in the spiritual nor in the natural world, is there a being or a thing but received its existence through Him Consequently, the Word is the Creator of the world, and consequently, the Word is God The turn of the phrase *through Him*, or, *by Him*, does not imply that the Word is not the independent Creator of the world the original active cause of creation, or that God created the world by the Word, as an artist works with his instruments The same form of speech is used by the Apostle Paul (1 Cor 1:9 and xii 8, 11) when speaking of the first original independent cause And in the passage before us the same form is used, that none may think the Son not to have been born By this form of speech the relation of the Son to the Father is shown, God the Father, who is invisible, and dwelleth in the inaccessible light, being revealed to us and acting in the Son, who is therefore the image of the invisible God The Son never acts separately or distinctly from the Father, and the creative activity of the Son is one with the creative activity of the Father, and the will of the Father is one with the will of the Son (John v. 19, 20) 'Without Him was not

anything made that was made.' In these words we have the complete repetition and explanation of what has gone before concerning the creative activity of the Word. In the created world, but only in the created world,— 'that was made,'—all has been created by Him. But that we may not imagine that, if all was made by Him, the Holy Spirit was also created by Him, the evangelist has added the words, 'that was made.' For the Holy Spirit is not a created being. 'I am not frightened,' writes Chrysostom, 'when it is said that all was brought into being through the Son,' as though under this word *all* must be also included the Holy Spirit. For the evangelist does not say *all*, but *all that was made*. And therefore it was not through the Son that the Father, or all that had the beginning of life, received life.

3. The original ordinary meaning of the word *χωρίς* is *without*, and I have so translated it.

4. For the sake of making the passage clear I have replaced the pronoun by the word for which it is substituted.

5. In translating the relative pronoun *ὃ*, as is generally necessary, I have prefixed the words *of that*.

6. *Γέγονεν* is the perfect, and cannot, therefore, be correctly translated *was*. The perfect in Greek signifies *was and is*. For this reason it must be translated, *was born and lives*.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>John i. 4: 'Εν<sup>1</sup> αὐτῷ ζῶν ἦν,<br/>καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς<sup>2</sup> τῶν ἀν-<br/>θρώπων.</p> | <p>In it was the power of life,<br/>and the life became the light of<br/>men.</p> |
|--|---|

5: Καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.<sup>3</sup> | So that the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness does not extinguish it.

1. Ἐν, besides its signification of *in*, has also the meaning of *in the power of*; thus, ἐν σοί, *in your power*. Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν therefore means, *in it was the power of life, the possibility of life*.

2. Φῶς, as is evident from the whole context, signifies *The true intelligence of life*. Compare John xii. 36: "Whilst the light is with you, believe ye in the light, and be sons of the light."

3. Καταλαμβάνειν: *to seize; to take; to encounter; to comprehend; to take up; to receive; to hold; to extinguish*,—is here used in the sense of, *to extinguish*.

It was said before that the intelligence of life became the beginning of all things. It is now said that only this intelligence gives life, and without it there can be no life. Life consists only in the intelligence of life. The fourth verse confirms this, and says: "Life is in the power of reason." Only the intelligence of life renders life possible. True life is the life which is illumined by the light of reason. Light is true life, light gives light, and there is no darkness in it. In the same way, intelligence of life gives life, in which there is no death.

All that has become truly living has become so through the intelligence of life. True life, according to the annunciation of Jesus Christ, consists alone in the intelligence of life. Or, to put it in another way: Light is the intelligence of men, and became the true life of men. In the same way as light is true existence, light

ness is the absence of light. And darkness cannot extinguish light."

John i. 6: Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸστατός, παρὰ θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης.

There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.

7: Οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν,<sup>1</sup> ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ Φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσι δι' αὐτοῦ.

He came for a testimony, to show the light of reason, that all might believe in the light of reason.

8: Οὐκ ἦν ἰκεῖνος τὸ Φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ Φωτός.<sup>2</sup>

He was not the light, but he came only that he might show the light of reason.

1. Ἡ μαρτυρία, *evidence, proof, testimony.*

2. These verses abruptly interrupt the train of thought on the signification of light, and enter into details concerning John the Baptist. They do not in any way confirm or contradict the fundamental idea, and for this reason, do not come within the province of my commentary, and may be passed over.

John i. 9: Ἦν<sup>1</sup> τὸ Φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν,<sup>2</sup> ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἐρχομενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

It became the actual light, the very light that lights every man that comes into the world.

10. Ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ<sup>3</sup> ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω.

It appeared in the world, and the world was begotten through it; but the world did not acknowledge it.

11: Εἰς τὰ ἴδια<sup>4</sup> ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον.<sup>5</sup>

It appeared in separate individuals, and they did not receive it into themselves.

12 : "Ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον<sup>6</sup> αὐτόν, ἔδω-  
κεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν<sup>7</sup> τέκνα θεοῦ  
γενέσθαι,<sup>8</sup> τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ  
ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.<sup>9</sup>

But all they who comprehended  
it, to them all it gave the possi-  
bility of becoming sons of God  
through belief in his being.

13 : Οἱ<sup>10</sup> οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ  
θελήματος σαρκός, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος  
ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.<sup>11</sup>

And these were conceived, not  
of blood and of fleshly desire, and  
of the carnal desire of man, but  
were begotten of God.

1. 'Hυ signifies here, as in previous passages, not so much *was*, as *became*.

2. 'Αληθινός does not mean *true*, but *the very, actual*.

3. Διά must again be translated *through*, and has the same meaning as in the foregoing passage. 'Εγένετο signifies *was begotten*.

4. Τὰ ἴδια signifies *separate, special*, and is evidently used in opposition to the world in general. The light was both in the whole world and in separate individuals. I have therefore added the word *men* to the word ἴδιος, *separate*.

5. Παραλαμβάνειν signifies *to receive, or take, into one's self*.

6. Λαμβάνειν, *to receive*, and most commonly, *to understand*.

7. 'Η ἐξουσία signifies *the permission, liberty, right, possibility, to do a thing*. This word, from another point of view, expresses the same idea as is expressed by the preposition ἐν in the phrase, ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶν ἡμ.

the power to give life, and therefore they who were begotten in it received the power."

8. Though *γίγνεσθαι* signifies *to be begotten*, it may in this place be translated, *to be*, or *to become*.

9. For the second time we have the phrase *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, and both times it is preceded by the verb *to believe*: to believe in his name. "*ὄνομα* in English is rendered *a name*, but in Hebrew it signifies *the person himself*. To combine both these ideas, we must translate it thus: in his entity, in the meaning and significance of his being.

10. *Οἱ*, which relates to the pronoun *τοῖς*, though not in agreement with it, is to be translated, *as well as they*.

11. *Γεννάειν* signifies *to conceive, to bring forth*. It is said that the life of the world is like light in darkness. The light shines in darkness, but the darkness does not contain it. The living principle lives in the world, but the world does not contain it in itself. And now, continuing the discourse concerning the intelligence of life, it is said that it is the light which illumines every man, the very light of life, which is revealed to every man; so that the intelligence of life is diffused over the whole world, in the world which lives by it; but the world does not know this, does not know that in it resides the strength, the foundation, the power of life. The intelligence of life is in separate individuals, and the separate individuals have not received and adopted it in themselves, have not understood that life exists only in it, or that the intelligence of life exists in its own production.



—in its son. But the son has not recognised his Father.

Neither the whole of humanity, nor the majority of people taken separately, have understood that they live only in and by the intelligence of life and their life, like the light that appears in darkness, but flickers <sup>W</sup> to be finally extinguished.

Life appeared in the midst of death, and was again swallowed up in death. But to those who understood the meaning of life, was given the possibility, through faith in their origin, to make themselves sons of it. The twelfth verse, which on a first reading strikes us as being so incoherent and confused, but which is so precise and clear, if we interpret it correctly, requires no alteration or addition to make it intelligible, and all we have to do is to substitute for the participle *πιστεύουσιν* the verbal substantive which expresses exactly the same idea. After having said, that life to men is like light in darkness, and that life manifests itself and is then swallowed up in death, the evangelist continues: But notwithstanding that it is so, the intelligence of life gives men the possibility of becoming its sons, and in this way alone can they escape death. In the twelfth verse it is said that the intelligence of life gives men the possibility of becoming sons of God. To understand what is meant by this expression, a clear and detailed explanation of which is given in the conversation with Nicodemus (John iii. 3-21), we must keep in mind what has been said before.

Intelligence is God: consequently, to become a son of God is to become a son of intelligence, to comprehend the meaning of life.

What is meant by a son? In the third verse it is

said, that all that has been begotten has been begotten through intelligence of life. That which is begotten is a son, and therefore we are all sons of intelligence. What, then, is meant by being a son of intelligence? To this question the fourth verse supplies an answer. It tells us that life is in the power of reason. And therefore there are two kinds of sonship of intelligence: one natural, for we are all sons of intelligence; the other dependent on our will, on our acknowledgment that life is only in the true intelligence of life. This twofold sonship has its counterpart in the sonship of the flesh. Every man, whether he will or not, is the son of his father, and every man is free to recognise, or not to recognise, his father. And therefore, "to become a son of intelligence" means, "to understand that life is in the power of reason." This same truth is set forth in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh verses. It is there said that men did not recognise that all life exists in the intelligence of life. And in the twelfth verse it is declared that, notwithstanding this, by believing in the true meaning of life, men can become the full sons of intelligence, since all proceed, not from the carnal desire of man and the blood of woman, but from intelligence.

We have but to acknowledge and believe this, to become the sons of intelligence by origin and confession.

And so the meaning of these verses will be—  
"Intelligence was in all men. It was in that which it had produced; all men live only in that they are begotten by intelligence. But men would not acknowledge their Father, and did not live in him; imagining

that they had their origin elsewhere than in him (vers 10, 11), But to every man, who understands this to be the source of his life, has been given by intelligence the possibility through this belief of becoming a son of God, who is Intelligence (ver 12) And therefore all are begotten and live, not from the carnal desire of man and the blood of woman but from God who is Intelligence (ver 13) In Jesus Christ was revealed the full and complete intelligence of life

|   |  |
|---|--|
| John 1 14 και ο λογος, σαρχ <sup>2</sup><br>εγενετο και ενσκηνωσεν <sup>1</sup> εν τω<br>και εθισαμεθα την οοξαν <sup>3</sup> αυτου,<br>δοξαν ως <sup>3</sup> μονογενοῦ, <sup>4</sup> παρ <sup>5</sup><br>πατρος, πληρη, <sup>6</sup> χαριτος <sup>7</sup> και<br>αληθειας <sup>8</sup> | And the intelligence of life<br>was joined to the flesh, and took<br>up its abode with us, and we<br>acknowledged its teaching, as<br>the teaching of him who is of<br>the same nature and cometh<br>from the Father the full and<br>complete teaching of service to<br>God in truth and in deed |
|---|--|

1 Σκηνώ I sit up a tent, I make a dwelling; I begin to live, I take up my abode.

2 Δόξα, derived from δοκέω, signifies *Ansicht, view, opinion, doctrine* Δόξα, in this passage, cannot be translated by the word *rumour*, or by the word *glory*.

3. Ὡς must not be here translated *however*, but *in that*. Owing to the turn of the sentence, it will be better to translate it by the word *as*, in the sense of *in that*.

4. Μονογενής, besides signifying *born the only begotten, the sole offspring*, also means, *of the same nature, race, quality*; eines Geschlechtes. Μόνος in compound

words of this kind does not mean *only*, but *the same*; of which we have many examples: as *μονόχρονος*, *simultaneous, of the same time*; *μονολόγος*, *of the same stature*. In the Gospel according to John, besides the present passage, the word occurs in three places—

John i. 18: No one has seen God at any time; the son, *who is of the same nature*, and who is in the bosom of the Father, has revealed him.

John iii. 16: God so loved the world, that he gave his only son, *who is of the same nature*, that everyone who believes in him may not perish, but may have everlasting life.

John vi. 18: He who believes in him shall not be condemned; but he who does not believe is already condemned, because he has not faith in the son of God, *who is of the same nature*.

In all these four passages the word is used in the same meaning, in the sense of, *one and the same nature*.

5. In many passages in the Gospel according to John, prepositions are used in the sense of a predicate. In the first verse of this chapter *πρός* is so used, just as in this verse *παρά* is employed. It signifies *coming*, or *proceeding from*, in the same way as *παρὰ θεοῦ* signifies *coming from God*.

6. Instead of *πλήρης* some copies read *πλήρη* in the accusative, referring to *δόξαν* and not to *λόγος*. It signifies *complete, full, finished*. The genitive cases *γαριτος* and *ἀληθείας* may depend on *πλήρη* or on *δοξαν*. In either case the meaning will be the same. Whether we understand that the intelligence of life, which the doctrine gives us, is complete, or that the

doctrine of the intelligence of life is complete and full, I prefer to connect the word *πλήρης* with *δόξα*, and not with *λόγος*, since in the oldest version, which I follow, *δόξα* stands after, and is, as it were intentionally, repeated.

7. *Χάρις* signifies: (1) *charm*; (2) *pleasantness*; (3) *amiability*, (4) *benevolence*; (5) *gratitude*; (6) *all that calls forth gratitude, benefaction*; (7) *sacrifice, offering one's self in sacrifice*, (8) *worship, culte*. In this place I translate *χάρις*, *worship*, because in the sixteenth verse it is said: Christ gave us *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος*, one *χάριν* for another. For the *χάριν* or worship according to the law of Moses, the law of service, Christ gave us his *χάριν*, service to God in a holy life according to his teaching.

8. *Ἀλήθεια* signifies *truth, verity, actuality, reality*. To express the first two significations of the word, *truth* is an adequate rendering; but to express *actuality, reality*, it is necessary to employ a periphrase, and to translate it as I have done, *in truth and in deed*.

Adopting the canonical construction of the words, namely, "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, filled with grace and glory; and we beheld His glory, as the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father," the translation of this verse will be—

"And the intelligence of life was instilled in us, the intelligence of life devoted to God in truth and in deed; and we received its teaching as the teaching of him who comes from the Father, and is of the same nature."

John i. 15: 'Ιωάννης μαρτυρεῖ John bears witness of him, and περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ κέκραγε λέγων· Οὗτος cries, and says: This is he of ἔν, ὃν εἶπον· Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, whom I spoke, he who came after ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν· ὅτι πρῶτος | me—he was begotten before me; μου ἦν, | because he was the first.

The fifteenth verse, relating to John the Baptist, cannot but strike us as being altogether out of place, and violating the sequence, not only of thought, but also of words. In the fourteenth verse the subject is the full doctrine of service to God; in the sixteenth verse the same word, πλήρης, in the form of the substantive πλήρωμα, connects the further exposition of service to God; and then suddenly, in the midst of the exposition, we come across a verse concerning the testimony of John the Baptist, which has no connection whatever with what goes before or what follows. This verse does not form a part of the exposition, and may be passed over as not coming within the province of my inquiry.

John i. 16: Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώ- And from its fulfilment we  
ματος<sup>1</sup> αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβο- have all attained to service to  
μεν,<sup>2</sup> καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ<sup>3</sup> χάριτος. God (in truth), in place of service  
to God (by the law).

1. Πλήρωμα signifies *fulness, repletion, accomplishment, fulfilment*. I translate it by the word *fulfilment*, because all this passage, referring to the significance of the teaching of Jesus Christ in relation to the law of Moses, is evidently in close connection with, and serves, as it were, as an explanation of, the seventeenth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew, where the same word, πλήρωμα, is used in the sense of *fulfilment*.

2. *Λαμβάνειν* signifies *to receive, to understand*; that is, to take into one's self, *ἐν σοὶ λαμβάνειν*.

3. *Ἀντί* has the exact signification of the Latin preposition *pro* and the English *for, for grace*. The translation of the preposition *ἀντί* by *über* in German, *Gnade über Gnade*, or by *sur* and *après* in French, *grâce sur grâce*, or *après grâce*, as Reuss translates it, cannot in anyway be defended.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>John i. 17: "Οτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωσέως ἐδόθη· ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.<sup>2</sup></p> | <p>Because the law was given by Moses. Service to God in truth and in deed came through Jesus Christ.</p> |
|--|---|

1. "*Οτι* is found in the earliest copies, and signifies *because, for*.

2. In my translation of the sixteenth and seventeenth verses I have departed from the generally received version. This departure is required by the laws of language, as well as for clearness of thought; and to show the connection of the verses with what goes before, and to preserve the sequence of idea. Just as in the case of the accepted translation of the words, *λόγος, word*; *γίγνομαι, create*; so now with the words, *δόξα, glory*; *μονογενής, only-begotten*; *ἀντί, upon*; *ὡς, as*; *χάρις, grace*; and *λαμβάνειν, to receive*,—it is the ordinary translation, and not my departure from it, that stands in need of justification.

Nothing but the desire to bring the words into accord with an already established opinion could have induced translators to give an interpretation of this passage

which neither corresponds with the original nor gives any clear or definite sense. Δόξα signifies *opinion, dogma, doctrine, creed*; and only in rare cases has it the meaning of *glory*, especially in the sense vulgarly attributed to the word *glory*.

The Church translation of the word δόξα in this place is *glory*; but this word *glory* conveys no clear meaning to the mind, unless we remember that the Church employs it here in its true original meaning, *doctrine, creed*. When, therefore, it says: "We saw His glory, as the glory of the only-begotten Son," the word *glory* must be understood in this particular sense. The Church often employs δόξα in this signification; as, for example, ὀρθή δόξα, *orthodoxy*. I have therefore substituted the word *teaching*; but am willing to retain the usual reading, provided the word *glory* be taken in the sense of *creed, teaching*. My translation of the word μονογενής, *of one nature*, is confirmed by the version given by Origen, who reads: ἀληθῶς μονογενής ὡς περὶ πατρός; truly of the same nature in that He is from the Father. Πάρα πατρός is intended to serve as an explanation of the meaning of μονογενής, exactly the same being from the Father.

Χάρις is translated by the word *gratia, grace, Gnade*. *Gratia* and *grace* signify *charm*; but these words are not here employed in this sense, but in the sense they afterwards came to have. And so the word *Gnade*, which signifies *favour*, must not be understood in this sense, but in another sense the word acquired later. But if we understand the word χάρις in the sense applied to it by the Church, we shall find that this meaning is altogether inapplicable in the phrase, χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, occurring in the sixteenth verse. •

*Gratia* for *grace* signifies that the grace of the earlier



covenant has been exchanged for the grace of the new covenant, but this interpretation is opposed to the teaching of the Church, and the orthodox have been obliged to change the meaning of the preposition *ἀντί*, on which depends the whole sentence, and have arbitrarily translated it, *uber, sur, après*.

By this manipulation the passage is made to bear the required meaning, namely, that from Christ we received a fuller grace. But this perversion of the language only renders the explanation of the entire passage, and particularly of the sixteenth verse, still more difficult. It is there said, that from this fulness we received grace for grace; and these words, we are told, mean that from Jesus Christ we received an addition to the grace received from Moses. But immediately afterwards we read that the law was given by Moses, and that grace and truth were given by Jesus Christ; from which, adopting this explanation, we can only conclude that grace and truth are put in opposition to the law of Moses.

The difficulty in translating this passage arises from the statement made in the fourteenth verse, that the intelligence of life was joined to the flesh, and that we acknowledged its teaching—or glory—as the teaching of him who comes from, and is of the same nature as, the Father, being filled, according to the Church interpretation, with *χάρις* and truth. Whatever meaning may be given to the word *χάρις*, one thing is already clear, the *λόγος* was filled with *χάρις* and truth.

But in the sixteenth verse, beginning with the word *ὅτι*, it is said: "Wherefore, from the fulness of Jesus Christ we received *χάρις*, in place of, or for, *χάρις*." Nothing is said of truth, whilst it has already been affirmed that he was Christ, and was full of *χάρις* and truth.

truth. And again, in the seventeenth verse, we read that *χάρις* and truth came through Jesus Christ. If it were not for the sixteenth verse, we might understand the whole to mean: "The *λόγος* was full of *χάρις* and truth"; though the idea is somewhat awkwardly expressed, since, instead of its being said, "He taught us, or gave us, *χάρις* and truth," it is said, "He was full of *χάρις* and truth"; and then the statement made in the sixteenth verse, that the law was given by Moses, and *χάρις* and truth were given by Jesus Christ, becomes quite plain. But the fifteenth verse, standing as it does between the fourteenth and sixteenth, instead of making the connection between the fourteenth and seventeenth verses clearer, completely destroys it. And even if we translate *ἀντί* by *on*, which we have no authority for doing, and understand under the first grace the law of Moses, we shall not be able to explain why, in the seventeenth verse, it is said that grace and truth were given through Jesus Christ. In that case the expression, *a fuller grace*, and not *grace and truth*, would have been employed. To give a coherent meaning to this passage, we must translate *χάρις*, *service to God*, and *ἀλήθεια*, *in deed, by deeds*. The passage will then read: "Which was given to us by Jesus Christ, since from his perfection we received a glad, free, living service to God, in place of an outward, formal service to God. The law was given by Moses, but service to God, fulfilled in deed, was given us by Jesus Christ."

In the preceding verses we have been told how the intelligence of life was made manifest in the world and in men: that men, by recognising the true intelligence of life to be the foundation of their life, were enabled to make themselves sons of God; and to retain within themselves the intelligence of life; and now we read how

this was accomplished in the world. It is said that the intelligence of life joined itself to the flesh, was revealed in the flesh, lived with us. These words in connection with the seventeenth verse, where it is said that the new teaching was given by Jesus Christ, cannot be understood otherwise than as relating to Jesus Christ.

The teaching consists in the acknowledgment of one's self to be the son of God, or of one nature with him, which as was said above, alone gives true life. These words, according to all that has gone before, signify that the foundation of Jesus Christ's teaching is, that life comes from the intelligence of life, and is of one nature with him. It is further said that this teaching is the full, complete teaching of service to God in deed. This teaching is full and complete, in that it unites service to God according to the law, with service to God in deed. That this is the true meaning of the passage, we have confirmatory evidence in all the subsequent doctrinal teaching in the Gospels, as, for instance, in John, concerning the relation of the Father to the son, and in Matthew and the other evangelists, the declaration that Christ came, not to abolish, but to fulfil the law. In the fourteenth verse it is said that the teaching of Jesus Christ, who comes from, and is of the same nature as, the Father, is the full and complete teaching of service to God in deed.

And so the meaning of these verses will be as follows:—

"In Jesus Christ the intelligence of life became with life, and was with us; and we received the teaching that life proceeds from the intelligence of life, and is of one nature with him, even as a son proceeds from the Father."

father, and is of the same nature with him ; we received the full teaching of service to God in deed, because through its fulfilment by Jesus Christ we have all attained to the new service of God in place of the old service to God ; since the law was given by Moses, and service to God in deed has come through Jesus Christ."

#### IV. IN WHAT THE INTELLIGENCE OF LIFE, AS REVEALED IN JESUS CHRIST, CONSISTED

John i. 18 : Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε<sup>1</sup> | No one has conceived God, and  
 πῶποτε ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν<sup>2</sup> εἰς<sup>3</sup> | no one ever will conceive him :  
 τὸν κόλπον<sup>4</sup> τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος<sup>5</sup> | the son, who is of the same  
 ἐξηγήσατο.<sup>5</sup> | nature, and is in the bosom of the  
 Father, has shown the way.

1. Ὁράειν, to see, to have a complete conception of. The verb is in the perfect tense, and οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε signifies, *no one has conceived, or ever will conceive.*

2. ὢν is more correctly translated by means of a gerund, for it signifies, *being in the Father, he alone shows the way.*

3. Εἰς signifies *movement towards something* ; εἰς, and not ἐν, is used to show that by ὁ ὢν εἰς is meant, *that he, who always is in the Father, and is, as it were, yearning to be in the heart, in the heart's core, of the Father, shows the way.*

4. Κόλπον, breast, bosom. To be in one's breast, or heart, signifies, *that one thing has entered another, is contained by another, is found within it.*

5. *Ἐξηγήσθαι* signifies *to narrate, to conduct, to show the way.*

The words, "No one has ever seen (conceived) God," besides their ordinary meaning, have also a special signification, in opposition to the Jewish maternal conception of God appearing on the heights of Sinai, or in the burning bush. If there could be the least doubt as to the direct and precise meaning of the first verse, that the intelligence of life became God, in the eighteenth verse it is expressly declared in words that admit of no misunderstanding that we cannot speak of a God whom we do not comprehend; that there is not, and cannot be, any other God than he who revealed himself as son of God, the intelligence of life, since the idea of life includes in itself the idea of its comprehension. No one has ever seen and conceived God: only the son, who is of one nature, and dwells in the bosom of the Father, has shown the way.

The son signifies "life," "living man"; as is said in the third verse, "All that has been begotten, has been begotten through intelligence of life"; and it is further said in the fourth verse, "In it was the power of life"; whilst, finally, in the twelfth and thirteenth verses we read, "The sons of God are they who acknowledge that they have been begotten through intelligence of life."

"Son of one nature" signifies, "such as the father." "Being in the bosom of the father" signifies that life, living man, being in the bosom of the father, that is, in accordance with the true intelligence of life, begotten with him, shows the way to him, but does not reveal him.

And so the meaning of the verse will be as follows:

"No one has ever seen, or conceived, God; and no one ever will see, or conceive, God: only life in accordance with the true intelligence of life has shown the way to him."

## V. RECAPITULATION

### THE ANNUNCIATION OF TRUE HAPPINESS MADE BY JESUS CHRIST, SON OF GOD

This annunciation was written that men might believe Jesus Christ to be son of God, and that by this faith they might receive life. No one has ever comprehended God, and no one will ever comprehend him. All that we know of God, we know in so far as we possess a true intelligence of life. And for this reason the intelligence of life is the true beginning of all things. What we term God is the intelligence of life, which is the beginning of all things, and which is the true God.

Without the intelligence of life there can be nothing. All has been produced from it. In it is the power of life. In the same way as the whole variety of things exist for us, because there is light, all the varieties of life, and life itself, exist, because there is the intelligence of life. It is the beginning of all

Life does not include all in the world. Life manifests itself in the world, as light in the midst of darkness. The light illumines so long as it burns, and the darkness does not retain the light, but remains darkness. So life manifests itself in the world in the midst of death, and does not retain life, but remains death.

The source of life, the intelligence of life, was in all

the world, and in every living man. But living men, living only in so far as they had the true intelligence of life, did not understand that they had been produced and were begotten through the intelligence of life.

They did not understand that the intelligence of life gave them the possibility to become one with it, so that they should live, not in the flesh, but in the intelligence of life. By understanding this, and by their belief in their oneness to intelligence, or the comprehension of life, men were able to have true life. But men did not understand this, and their life in the world was like light in darkness.

No one has ever comprehended, and no one ever will comprehend God, the cause of all causes. Only life in accordance with the true intelligence of life has shown the way to him.

And thus Jesus Christ, living in the midst of us, revealed in the flesh the true intelligence of life; for his own life proceeded from it, was of one nature with it, even as a son proceeds from the father, and is of one nature with him.

And, looking on his life, we understood the full teaching of service to God in deed, and, in consequence of its perfection, have received the new service to God in place of the old service. The law was given by Moses, but the service to God in deed has come through Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen, or ever will see God, only life in accordance with the true intelligence of life has shown the way to him.

## CHAPTER I

### INCARNATION OF THE INTELLIGENCE OF LIFE

#### I. THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST

LUKE i. 5-25. In these verses are related the miraculous events that accompanied the birth of John the Baptist.

These events have nothing in common with the teaching of Jesus Christ, and the annunciation of true happiness made by him. They do not even relate to Jesus Christ, and therefore, whatever meaning and signification may be given to them, they have no bearing on our views as to the teaching of Jesus Christ.

Luke i. 26-79. These verses record the miraculous events that preceded and accompanied the birth of Jesus Christ, and have to do with wonderful incidents that are altogether foreign to the teaching of Jesus Christ.

Matt. i. 1-17 and Luke iii. 23-38. In these verses are set forth the two genealogies of Jesus Christ. Even if these tables of descent could be brought into harmony, one with the other, they would still have no reference to Christ's teaching, and however we may



understand them, can neither add to, nor take from, nor in any way affect his teaching, and, consequently, all the passages here referred to may be passed over

Matt 1 18 Ιουος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ  
ἡ γεννησις οὕτω, ἦν Μνηστευθεῖσα,  
γὰρ ἦν, μητρος, αὐτοῦ Μαρίας καὶ  
Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοῦ,  
εὐρεθὲν ὅτι γαστροὶ ἐχρυσάεντες ἐκ Πνεύματος  
ἁγίου, καὶ οὕτως

19 Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς,  
δικαίος ὢν, καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν  
παράδειγμα-ποιεῖν, ἐβουλόθη λαθεῖν  
αὐτὴν ἰσχυρῶς

20 Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμώ-  
μενος, ἰδὼν ὅτι ἡ Κυρίου κατ'  
ἐμφάνει αὐτῷ, λέγων Ἰωσήφ υἱοῦ  
Δαβὶδ, μὴ φοβῆθαι, παρακαλεῖται  
Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκα σου, τὸ γὰρ  
ὅτι ἐκ γέννησός ἐστι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον

21 Γενήσεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλεῖσιν  
τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ  
σώσει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρ-  
τιῶν αὐτῶν

24 Διεγερθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ  
τοῦ ὕπνου, ἐποίησεν ὡς προσέταξεν  
αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου, καὶ παρ-  
έλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ

25 Καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσεν αὐτὴν,  
ὥς ὅτι ἔτεκε τὸν υἱόν αὐτῆς τὸν  
πρωτότοκον καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα  
αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦν.

The birth of Jesus Christ was  
after this fashion. When his  
mother Mary, was betrothed  
to Joseph, before he went in  
unto her, she became big with  
child.

Joseph, her husband, was a  
just man, and did not wish to  
expose her, and thought to send  
her away privately.

But whilst he was thinking to  
do this, he saw an angel, sent by  
God, appear to him in a dream,  
who said to him: Fear not to  
take unto thee Mary thy wife,  
for that which shall be born of her  
shall be born of the Holy Spirit.

And she shall bear a son, and  
thou shalt call him Jesus, which  
signifies the Saviour, for he shall  
save his people from their sins.

And Joseph, having awakened  
from his sleep, did as the angel  
had commanded him, and took  
her to him to be his wife,

And he did not know  
until she had borne her first-born,  
and called him, Jesus.

1. The words, *of the Holy Spirit*, in this passage signify the higher birth, the same that, as we learn from the conversation with Nicodemus, is common to all men (see Chap. III. section 4).

In the twenty-second and twenty-third verses it is declared that in the birth of Christ a certain prophecy was fulfilled. The application of the prophecy is in the highest degree far-fetched, and not only fails to support, but actually contradicts, the writer's argument.

The meaning of the verses will be as follows:—

“There was a virgin named Mary. The virgin was with child, but it was not known by whom. Her betrothed husband took pity on her, and, concealing her shame, received her into his house. From her and the unknown father was born a son. The name Jesus was given to the boy. And this Jesus is the intelligence of life revealed in the flesh. And he showed men the way to God, whom no man has ever seen or ever will see. And this Jesus is the same Jesus, son of God, who has given to the world the teaching of which John speaks, and which is set forth in the Gospels.”

Luke ii. 1–21, ii. 22–38, ii. 39; Matt. ii. 1–12, ii. 13–23. In these passages is described the birth of Jesus Christ and his wanderings with his mother, which wanderings were accompanied with miraculous events and portents. There is nothing in them referring to the teaching of Christ, or even to events that could have any influence on him. The only explanation that can be given of these passages is to be found in the legends that at all times and in all ages, have gathered around

the childhood of men who became celebrated and famous after death. The intention and aim of their inventors is to give importance to the individual by connecting his name with predictions and miracles. The stereotyped tone of these passages, reminding us of many similar apocryphal legends connected with other religions, strikes us by its incongruity with the other portions of the same books. It is impossible for anyone, who has once really understood the meaning of the introductory verses to the Gospel of John, to give the least credit to any of these fabulous stories. By accepting one we necessarily exclude the other. He who has once grasped the meaning of the doctrine, that the son of God is the intelligence of life, as is set forth in that Gospel, is compelled to regard all this narrative of the events supposed to have preceded the births of John and Jesus, as well as the whole story of Christ's birth and the events immediately following, as unintelligible and, what is more important, as superfluous and noxious fables. For if we attribute any meaning to, or acknowledge the possibility of, Christ's miraculous birth from a virgin and the Holy Spirit, we thereby prove that we have not yet learned the meaning of the intelligence of life being joined to the flesh.

The sole object of all these alleged miracles is to justify and excuse the low and humble birth of Jesus Christ. It has been said that Jesus Christ is the true intelligence of life, and that he alone has revealed to us God. And this same Jesus was born of a virgin in circumstances that are counted by men to be shameful. All these passages, then, are designed to be a justification of, from a human point of view, this shameful birth. The shameful birth and the ignorance of Jesus as to who was his father in the flesh, form the one trait in these verses that has no

signification as far as the subsequent teaching of Jesus Christ is concerned.

## II. THE CHILDHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST

Luke ii. 40: Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠύξανε, καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι, πληρούμενον σοφίας· καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

The boy grew in stature and in spirit, and wisdom increased within him, and the grace of God was upon him.

41: Καὶ ἵσπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα.

And his parents went every year to Jerusalem, to keep the feast of the passover.

42: Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἑτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς·

And when Jesus was twelve years old, his parents came to Jerusalem, according to their custom, to keep the feast.

43: Καὶ τελευτήσαντων αὐτῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐν τῷ ὑποσπρίφειν αὐτοὺς, ὑπέμεινε Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ· καὶ οὐκ ᾔστω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ.

And when the feast was over, and they were already preparing to go home, the boy Jesus remained behind at Jerusalem. And Joseph and the mother of Jesus did not remark it.

44: Νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ εἶναι, ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὀδὸν καὶ ἀνέβησαν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς.

They thought that he was with his companions, and they had made a day's journey, when they began to seek for him among their relations and acquaintances.

Καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες αὐτὸν, ὑπέστρεψον εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ζητοῦντες

And they did not find him, and returned to Jerusalem to look for him.

Καὶ ἐγένετο, μεθ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὅτε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καθεζόν-

And on the third day they found him in the temple, sitting



Luke iii. 23: *Kai autòs ἦν ὁ* And Jesus was about thirty  
*Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχο-* years of age, and was believed to  
*μένου, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ,* be the son of Joseph.  
*καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ.*

The above verse, the twenty-third of the third chapter of Luke, has been inserted here to preserve the continuity of the narrative. The verses relating to John the Baptist will be inserted in their proper place.

The meaning of these verses will be as follows:—  
 “Concerning the childhood of Jesus Christ, it is only related that he grew up without a father, waxed strong in mind, and was gifted with a wisdom beyond his years. It was thus made evident that God loved him. Only one detail connected with his childhood is related, namely, how he was lost whilst Mary and Joseph were keeping the Passover at Jerusalem, and how they found him in the temple, sitting with the teachers. He was listening to them, and asking them questions; and all were astonished at his wisdom. His mother began to reproach him for having left them, and told him how they had looked for him. And he said to her: ‘Why did you look for me? Do you not, then, know where to look for any son—in the house of his father? You know, I have no father in the flesh; for God is my Father. The temple is the house of God. If you had looked for me in the temple, in the house of my Father, you would have found me.’”

This narrative, besides showing us the extraordinary wisdom of Jesus in his childhood, further reveals to us with marvellous clearness the natural sequence of events by which the wise lost child, seeing around him children, each one of whom had his father in the

flesh, knew that he himself had no father in the flesh, and thus claimed God, the beginning of all things, to be his Father.

The doctrine that God is the Father of all things is taught in the Jewish books. Thus we read in the prophet Malachi (ii. 10): "Have we not all of us one Father? Has not, then, one God created us all?"

### III. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Mark i. 4. Ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων<sup>1</sup> ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ κηρύσσων βαπτισμα μετανοίας<sup>2</sup> εἰς<sup>3</sup> ἀφ᾽ ἑσθίν ἀμαρτιῶν<sup>4</sup>.

John appeared in the wilderness, and exhorted the people to wash themselves in sign of a change of life and of emancipation from evil.

1. *Βαπτίζω* signifies *I bathe, I wash*. I prefer either of these common expressions to the word *baptize*, because the Church has attached to the word *baptism* the idea of a sacrament; and secondly, because this word does not imply the action itself which is expressed by the verb *βαπτίζω*.

2. *Μετανοία* literally signifies *a change of mind, a change of opinion*. The word *repentance* would give the true meaning, if the Church had not assigned a special and restricted signification to the term *repentance*. *Μετανοία* rather implies *renovation*; but we must understand the word, not so much in the sense of *repentance* as in the sense of *spiritual change*.

3. I translate the preposition *εἰς*, *in sign of*.

fication it often has. The ordinary translation, *for*, is out of place here.

4. *Ἀμαρτία* signifies *sin*, but not in the sense of a religious or moral sin, but rather in the sense of a *mistake, a fault*. I have translated it *error*.

Matt. iii. 4: Αὐτός δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχε τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ τροφή αὐτοῦ ἦν ακρίδες καὶ μέλι θύριον.<sup>1</sup>

And John wore a dress of camel hair; and he was girded with a leathern strap. And he fed on locusts and herbs.

1. Scientific writers suppose that by the term *wild honey*, is to be understood the gum or bark of trees. To make the verse intelligible, and to express the strictness of the fast, I have used the word *herbs*.

Mark i. 1: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>1</sup>

The beginning of the annunciation of happiness made by Jesus Christ, son of God,

2: Ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις: Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

was even as had been written by the prophets: "Behold, I send my messenger; that he may prepare me the way" (Mal. iii. 1).

1. To connect the words, *the beginning of the annunciation of happiness*, with the words, *as had been written by the prophets*, we must introduce the words, *was even*; that is to say, "The appearance of John the Baptist was, according to the words of the prophets, the beginning of the annunciation of true happiness."



Mark i 3 Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ Ἐτοιμασατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου εὐθείας τοίετέ τας, τρεβους αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup> | A voice cries to you. Prepare a way for the Lord in the wilderness, make his path easy (Isa xl.3),

Luke iii 5 Πασα Φαραγξ πληρωθῆναι, καὶ παν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθῆται καὶ ἴσται τὰ στενωπὰ εἰς εὐθείαν, καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδὸν, λείας· | That every hollow may be made level, and hit every hillock and hill may be made low, that all the crooked ways may be made straight, and the hills be made a smooth road (Isa xl 4);

6 ἴσται πάντα σαρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ | And all the world shall behold salvation from God (Isa xl 5).

1. For the changes made in the punctuation, and consequent change in the general idea, of this passage, I am indebted to *Les Prophètes*, by M Reuss, whose translation from the Hebrew runs as follows.—

A voice cries

Prepare the road of the Eternal One through the desert!

Make level a way across the land for our God!

Let every hollow be raised,

Let every mountain, every hill be lowered,

Let every rough place be changed into a plain,

And let the steep ridges be turned into valleys;

That the glory of the Eternal One may appear,

And that all men and women may together behold it!

It is the mouth of the Eternal One that hath spoken.

Matt. iii. 1; Luke iii 1. In these verses are related events which do not refer either to Jesus Christ or the subject-matter of his teaching.

Matt. iii. 2: "Ἐγγίζει ἡ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν." | (And John said:) Behold, the kingdom of heaven has already come.

1. *ἤγγικε* is in the perfect tense, and therefore signifies something already accomplished and being now accomplished. The verb signifies *to come near*. In the perfect tense it implies that the kingdom of God has already come so near that it cannot approach nearer. And, in truth, according to all the prophecies, the kingdom of God was in the future, and was approaching. Now, it has come quite near. And therefore *ἤγγικε* must in this place be translated, *has already come*.

2. *Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, the *heavenly kingdom*. The Church has given an arbitrary signification to these words. They really signify, "a kingdom made up of believers." Jesus Christ is its king. It is plain that John the Baptist, who preached before Jesus came, could not speak of this kingdom. For those to whom they were addressed, these words, when spoken by John the Baptist, must have borne a different meaning to what they had, when spoken by Jesus Christ. To all Jews the heavenly kingdom meant the advent of God into the world, and his rule over the peoples of the earth. The prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel, Zechariah, and Malachi are filled with predictions of its establishment. The peculiarity of John the Baptist's preaching, distinguishing it from that of the prophets, consists in that, whilst the other prophets spoke indefinitely of the coming kingdom of God, John the Baptist declared this kingdom to have already come, and its establishment to have been already accomplished. Almost all the prophets predicted external miraculous and terrible events that were to accompany its establishment, and Jeremiah is the only one of them who understood the reign of God in men as being accompanied,

not with external manifestations, but with the spiritual inward union between God and men; and therefore the assurances of John the Baptist, that the heavenly kingdom had already come, notwithstanding that there had been no strange terrible signs and portents, must be understood as applying to the kingdom of God within us, the establishment of which had been prophesied by Jeremiah.

### THE BAPTISM AND PREACHING OF JOHN

Matt. iii. 5: Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

And the people came to John from Jerusalem, and from the villages round about the Jordan, and from the whole land of Judea.

6: Καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

And he washed in the Jordan all those who acknowledged and confessed their errors.

Luke iii. 7: "Ἐλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις<sup>1</sup> βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Γεννήματα ἰχιδνῶν,<sup>2</sup>

And he said to the people: O ye race of serpents!

1. In Matt. iii. 7 it is said that the words immediately following were addressed only to the Pharisees and Sadducees. Luke relates that they were spoken to all the people. As there is nothing in the words applying exclusively to the Pharisees and Sadducees, Luke's version is to be preferred.

2. It is a popular belief that serpents have a presentiment of fire, and crawl away from places about to become a prey to the flames.

Luke iii. 7: Τίς ἐπέδειξεν ὑμῖν | Who has taught you to flee  
 Φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; | from the approaching will of  
 God?

1. Ὀργή signifies *temperament, expression of will*. I have translated it, *the will of God*.

Luke iii. 8: Ποιήσατε οὖν καρ- | Bring forth, therefore, fruits  
 πὺς ἀξίους, τῆς μετανόας. | suitable to the change of life.

• 1. Ἀξίος, with a genitive case, signifies *worthy of something, such as*; and perhaps is best translated, *suitable to*.

The words, serving as a continuation of the eighth verse, and relating how the Jews claim Abraham to be their father, concern exclusively the Jews, and convey no instruction for us; besides which, they interrupt the discourse on the tree and its fruits, and for this reason may be passed over.

Luke iii. 9: "Ἡδὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη, | The axe is already laid to the  
 πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· | root of the tree; and, if the tree  
 πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν | does not bring forth good fruit,  
 καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ | the tree shall be cut down for  
 βάλλεται. | firewood, and be burned.

10: Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι, | And the people asked him:  
 λέγοντες· Τί οὖν ποιήσομεν; | What must we do?

11: Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· | He answered them and said:  
 Ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας, μεταδύτω τῷ | He who has two garments, let  
 ὁ μὴ ἔχοντι· καὶ ὁ ἔχων βρώματα, | him give to him who has not;  
 μεταδόςτω. | and he who has bread, let him  
 also do the same.

12 : Ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι<sup>1</sup> | Then came to his washing, the  
 βαπτισθῆναι καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν | tax-collectors, and said to him :  
 Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσομεν ; | Teacher, what shall we do ?

1. Τελώνης signifies *tax-collector*. The taxes were leased out by the collectors.

Luke iii. 13 : Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ δια- | John said to them : Extort not  
 τεταγμένον ὑμῖν πράσσετε. | more than is due to you.

14 : Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτόν καὶ | And the soldiers asked : What  
 στρατευόμενοι, λέγοντες· Καὶ ἡμεῖς shall we do ? And he said : Do  
 τί ποιήσομεν ; καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· not oppress anyone, and do not  
 Μηδένα διασεύσῃτε, μηδὲ συκοφαντή- lie against anyone. And be con-  
 σῃτε· καὶ ἀρκείσθε τοῖς ὄψωνίους tent with your condition in life.  
 ὑμῶν.

The fifteenth verse, in which John declares that a stronger than he has come into the world, is made by Luke to serve as an answer to the supposition that he was the Christ. But these words are a direct continuation of the discourse concerning the making ready a path for him who is to come, and do not in any way touch the question, was he the Christ, or not ? He does not say a word as to whether he was, or was not, the Christ. For this reason the verse has been omitted.

Luke iii. 18 : Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ | And addressing the people, he  
 ἕτερα παρακαλῶν εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν announced to them many other  
 λαόν. | things concerning true happiness.

Matt. iii. 11 : Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω<sup>1</sup> | And he turned to the people  
 ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι, εἰς μετάνοιαν· ὁ δὲ and said : I wash you with water  
 ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου in sign of a change of life. But  
 ἐστί, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανός, τὰ ὑπα- he is come who is stronger than

θήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. | I, and in comparison with whom I am worth nothing.

Mark i. 8: Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι· αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.<sup>2</sup> | I wash you with water, but he shall purify you with spirit and fire.

1. *Βαπτίζω*, besides signifying *I wash*, has also the meaning *I purify*; and the general turn of the passage requires that we should here understand the word *βαπτίζω* in the sense of *I purify*.

2. *Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ*. In many versions we find the word *holy* introduced, not only in this passage, but wherever the Spirit is spoken of. In Mark the words *and fire* are omitted, though they occur in Luke and Matthew. The meaning of the verse is: "As a master purifies his thrashing-floor with fire, so shall he, who is stronger in spirit, purify you."

Matt. iii. 12: Οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διακαθαρίει τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνάξει τὸν σίτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστω. | His shovel is in his hand, and he will purify his thrashing-floor. The wheat he will gather together, and the chaff he will burn.

13: Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην, τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. | And Jesus was purified by John.

16: Καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, αὐθις ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος. | And, having been washed, Jesus immediately went up from the water.

The fourteenth and fifteenth verses are not altogether

intelligible, and, if we attribute to them the meaning traditionally assigned to them, have no bearing on the teaching of John.

In the latter portion of the sixteenth verse we have the story of a miraculous event, which is at once unnatural and incomprehensible. It conveys no instruction to us, but, on the contrary, tends to obscure the teaching of Christ. In what way the numerous miracles introduced into their narratives by the evangelists obscure Christ's teaching, will be explained in another place.

#### V. GENERAL IDEA OF THE TEACHING OF JOHN

In what consisted the teaching of John? It is generally said that we know nothing, or very little, of what John taught. And, in truth, if we suppose that John only declared the coming of the heavenly kingdom, which Jesus taught, or that he merely prophesied, like the earlier prophets, the advent of God, we shall find nothing new or important in the teaching of John. But if we will only cease to look on the written word as a kind of fairy tale, in which we are always finding miracles and prophecies, the preaching of John at once obtains a deep significance. Church commentators are fond of representing him as the forerunner of the Christ, whilst freethinkers picture him as one of those progressive poets, called prophets, who at all times have flourished among the Jews, and whose chief mission it was to preach general moral truths. But if we will only give ourselves the trouble to understand the words lying before us in their simple natural meaning, and read

them without any preconceived notions, the preaching of John will at once be found to be of supreme and immediate significance.

It was declared by John that the kingdom of heaven was near at hand. Not one of the prophets had ever spoken thus. They all declared that God would come and make himself king, and rule over his people; but they contented themselves with vaguely predicting that this would be, and never specified the time. John, on the contrary, said: "Behold, the kingdom of heaven is at hand!" The peculiarity of his preaching, then, consisted in that he affirmed the kingdom of God to be quite near at hand; that, indeed, it was already come. We gather that Jesus Christ, at least, understood his words to mean this from the expression he uses in Luke xvi. 16: "the law and the prophets up to John." After John, the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and every man takes it by violence.

This, then, must be the idea, the meaning, of John's preaching. Never before had a prophet predicted this. All the previous prophets, with the single exception of Jeremiah (xxxi. 31), had foretold the extraordinary events that were to accompany the advent of God: persecutions, famines, cold, plagues, earthquakes, wars, and the triumph of the flesh. John foretold none of these things. He only taught that no man can escape God's will, that all that is unnecessary will be destroyed and wiped out, and that all that is necessary will be preserved and will remain. His only exhortation was: "Live the new life!" This constitutes the leading peculiarity of his preaching, and forms its chief and principal theme. "I wash you with water; but that which must purify you and completely renew you is the



spirit, that is, something unseen, that is not of the flesh." John said: "Till now, the prophets have told you that the kingdom of heaven will come; but I tell you, it is already come. That you may enter it, you must live the new life, and cast off the errors of the old life. I can only purify you outwardly; the spirit within you can alone purify you." This is the teaching to which Jesus Christ listened. "The kingdom of God is come, but before we can enter it, we must be purified by the spirit within us."

And, in this way, filled with the spirit, Jesus Christ goes into the wilderness, that he may be tried and proved in the spirit.

## VI. TEMPTATION OF JESUS IN THE WILDERNESS

Luke iv. 1: Ἰησοῦς δὲ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου πλήρης ὑψότρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.<sup>1</sup>

Then Jesus, filled with the spirit, went up from Jordan into the wilderness.

2: Ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.<sup>2</sup>

And the tempter tried him.

1. In Luke it is said, καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, but in the oldest copies we read, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; from which it is plain that Jesus, being in the same spirit in which he was when he went up from Jordan, spent forty days in the wilderness. It is true that in Matthew it is said, ἀνήχθη εἰς . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, *He was carried by the spirit*; and in Mark we read, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκβάλλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον *The spirit brought him into the wilderness*. Luke recor-

ciles the two versions, and says, *He was filled with the spirit, and in this spirit he spent forty days in the wilderness.*

2. Διάβολος we translate *the tempter*, to preserve the true meaning of the word, as distinct from the generally received idea of the devil.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Mark i. 13. Καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, τεираζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανα· καὶ ἦν ἀεὶ τῶν θηρίων·</p> | <p>And Jesus was in this wilderness forty days, and eat nothing, and was weakened by long fasting.</p> |
|---|--|

Luke iv. 2: Καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις· καὶ συνετελεθεισῶν αὐτῶν, ὑστερον

Matt. iv. 2: Καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα, ὕστερον ἐπεινάσθη.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>3: Καὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ ὁ πειράζων, εἶπεν· Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπέ ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ᾄρται γενῶνται.</p> | <p>And the tempter came to him, and said: If thou be son of God, command that these stones become bread.</p> |
|--|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>4: 'Ο δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπε· Γεγραπται· Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζῆσται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ.</p> | <p>And he, answering, said: It is written, Man lives not by bread, but by all that comes from the mouth of God (comes in the spirit).</p> |
|---|---|

1. I omit the word *ῥήματι*, since it is not found in the Hebrew text. These words are taken from Deut. viii. 3, and the context explains their meaning, as may be seen from the following translation:—

"Remember the path by which the Eternal One led you through the wilderness for forty years, that he might humble you, try you, and know whether you observed his commandments. He humbled you, and tormented you with hunger, and fed you with manna of which neither you nor your fathers knew, that he might teach you how man lives, not by bread alone, but by all that proceeds from the mouth of God. Your garments did not wear out all these forty years, and your feet did not swell. Know, then, that your eternal God watched over you, even as a father watches over his son" (Deut. viii. 2-5).

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Luke iv. 9: Καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερυγίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Εἰ ὁ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω· | The tempter brought Jesus Christ to Jerusalem, and placed him on a wing of the temple, and said to him. If thou be son of God, cast thyself down from hence: |
|---|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 10: Γέγραπται γάρ· "Ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλαξάσαι σε· | For it is written, that he has commanded his messengers to watch over and take care of thee: |
|---|--|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 11: Καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσά σε, μήποτε προσκλύψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν | And that they shall bear thee in their hands, lest thou shouldst dash thy foot against a stone (Ps. xci. 11, 12). |
|--|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 12: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· "Ὅτι" εἴρηται· Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις <sup>2</sup> Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου. | And Jesus answered him and said: Therefore it is said, Thou shalt not mistrust thy God (Deut. vi. 16). |
|---|--|

1. In Luke we have here the word *ὅτι*, *because*; and Jesus says, "I do not throw myself down, because it is written: 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord.'"

2. *Ἐκπειράσεις* signifies literally, *shalt question by*.

torture; but in connection with the passage in Exodus (xvii. 2, 7) from which it is taken, it signifies here: *shall mistrust*:—

“The people began to murmur against Moses, because there was no water. And Moses addressed himself to the Lord. And the Lord bade him come near the rock in Horeb, and smite it with his rod, so that water might come out of it, and the people might drink. And he called the name of the place Massah-Meribah, because the people mistrusted the Lord, saying, Is Jehovah for us, or against us?”

Luke iv. 5: Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ὁ διαβόλος εἰς ὄρος ὑψαλτόν, ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης<sup>1</sup> ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ.

And the tempter led him up to the top of a high mountain, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world in the twinkling of an eye.

6: Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ διαβόλος· Σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἰσχυρίαν ταυτην ἁπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν· ὅτι ἱμοὶ παραδίδονται, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν θέλω, δίδωμι αὐτήν.

And he said to him: I will give thee all this sovereignty and their glory, for they have been given over to me, and to whom I will I give them.

1. *Οἰκουμένος, inhabited.* The word *earth* is understood, and we must translate, *all the peoples living on the earth.*

Luke iv. 7. Σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνῇς ἐνώπιόν μου, ἔσται σου πάντα.

If thou wilt worship me, all shall be thine.

8: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· ὅτι γέγραπται· γὰρ Ἠ προσκυνῇς Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.<sup>2</sup>

Then Jesus answered and said: Avaunt, (evil spirit,) enemy: for it is written, Honour thy God, and work for him alone (Deut. vi. 13).

1. Satan: a word having a definite meaning. In Hebrew it signifies *an enemy*, and I have so translated it.

2. Λατρεύω, *I work for hire*. The meaning of this word, very seldom used, and only once employed in this sense, is of great importance. It does not mean *I serve*, or *I work*, in our sense of the word; but *I work for a reward*; that is, "I work unwillingly, with effort; not for the sake of the work itself, but with some other aim."

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Luke iv. 13: Καὶ συντελείσας<br>πάντα πειρασμὸν ὃ διὰ βολος, ἀπέστη<br>ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ. | Then the tempter departed<br>from him for a while, |
|---|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Matt. iv. 11. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος ἰ<br>προσῆλθον, καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ. | And the power of God came<br>upon him, and served him. |
|---|--|

1. As by the word ἄγγελος is understood *a messenger*, *God's messenger*, I have translated it, *the power of God*.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Luke iv. 14: Καὶ ἐπίστρεψεν ὁ<br>Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Πνεύματος<br>εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. | And Jesus returned in power<br>of spirit to Galilee. |
|---|--|

The whole story of the Temptation is particularly deserving of attention, inasmuch as it has always been a stumbling-block to Church commentators: the very idea of God being tempted by God is an inherent difficulty in the narrative, from which there is no escape.

I transcribe at length, and word for word, the Archimandrite Michael's commentary on this episode in the life of Christ:—

"*Then.* Immediately after the Holy Spirit had descended upon Him at His baptism, and not sometime after, as certain commentators would have us believe.

"*Spirit.* By the word spirit is here meant, not the spirit of Jesus Himself, or the tempting spirit, but the Holy Spirit that had descended upon Jesus.

"*Into the wilderness.* Tradition points out as the place of temptation a wilderness, called the Forty Days' Wilderness, lying to the west of Jericho; a wild and weird spot, in which savage beasts and rude brigands have their haunts. It is sometimes called the Wilderness of Jericho.

"*To be tempted.* *To tempt*, in general, signifies *to try, to prove.* In a more restricted sense, *to tempt* signifies *to allure*, to dispose people to something bad by presenting to them the good side of a bad thing, and thereby proving the moral strength of the person tried. Here the word signifies, *to try whether in truth Jesus was the Christ, to try Him by tempting Him to sinful acts.*

"*By the devil.* The word *devil* properly signifies *an apostate, an adversary, an enemy.* In the Scriptures the word is used in a definite sense, and signifies *the fallen angel*, who did not persevere in good, who is the enemy of all that is good, the evil being, the enemy to good, and, in particular, the enemy to man's salvation. In what form he presented himself to the Saviour we are not told by the evangelists. It may be, he did not appear in a rude sensible form, and indeed his subsequent acts are scarcely consistent with such an idea; but there can be no doubt that it was not, as some have supposed, a mere personification of the tempting thoughts of the Lord Himself. • On the contrary, whatever form it may have

assumed, it was a real and actual appearance of the Evil Spirit who was permitted to tempt the Saviour.

*"After He had fasted.* For forty days, or for forty nights, He had refrained from all nourishment, and had eaten nothing all that time. Examples of fasts lasting as long are given in the Old Testament. Thus, for instance, the prophet Elijah fasted forty days, and Moses also fasted the same number of days. Christ fasted, not that it was necessary for Him to do so, but He fasted forty days for our instruction, and did not exceed that number of days, lest by excessive and superhuman abstinence He should cast a doubt on the reality of His incarnation. Had He fasted longer, many might have made the unnatural prolongation of His fast serve as an argument against the reality of His assumption of our flesh.

*"And He afterwards felt endangered.* After the forty days were ended, He began to feel the need for nourishment, thereby manifesting His human nature.

*"And there came to Him.* When the Lord was exhausted with hunger, the tempter, profiting by the opportunity, came openly to Him.

*"The tempter,* that is, the devil. If Thou be the Son of God, that is, the Messiah, whom at His baptism God Himself named His beloved Son. The tempter, who had heard the voice testify from heaven, 'This is My beloved Son,' and who had also heard the glorious testimony of John the Baptist, now suddenly beheld Him suffering from hunger. This led him to doubt. On the one hand, remembering what had been said of Jesus, he could not think Him to be a mere man; but, on the other hand, seeing Him hungry, he could not believe Him to be the Son of God. In this state of mind he addresses Him in ambiguous terms.

"*These stones*: stones that probably were lying in the wilderness, in the place of Christ's fast and temptation. The essential point in this temptation lies in the supposition that Christ would perform an unnecessary miracle merely to satisfy His bodily cravings; that is, make an unworthy use of His divine power, and thereby manifest a feeling of self-pride and antagonism to the will of God. He had only just been solemnly proclaimed the Son of God; and now an opportunity is afforded Him of proving to Himself His Godship by a miraculous act. He was hungry. If, then, He is in truth the Messiah, why need He suffer the pangs of hunger, when by one single word He can change stones into bread, and appease His hunger? What sin can there be in converting stones into bread? This sin: to listen to and obey the suggestion of the devil in anything, however harmless in itself.

"*It is written*, etc. Christ parries the first temptation in the same way as He later repels the second and third, by the word of God. He refutes the tempter with a text from Deut. viii. 3. Moses in this place says that God, to humble the Jewish people, plagued them with hunger, and then fed them with manna, that was before unknown to them or their fathers, in order to teach them that man lives not by bread alone, and that the true life of man is supported by other things, such as manna, and, in general, by all that the word of God shows to proceed from His mouth. And the Saviour, by quoting this text, would have the tempter understand that it is not necessary to perform a miracle and change stones into bread, but that hunger may be appeased by other means, by the command, by the word, or by an act of God. This is the direct and immediate lesson



conveyed by the text. But of course it also refers to the spiritual food with which the true believer is nourished and which makes him forget the need of bodily food so that for a while he feels no desire for it. This spiritual food is the word of God, His teaching, commandments and statutes, the fulfilments of which forms the food of the spirit and which is more necessary for the sustenance of the soul than material food for the body. Every word spoken by God like food given to the hungry sustains and supports the spiritual life of man. God is able to feed the hungry with His word alone. And therefore this is the meaning of Christ's answer: 'I do not now stand in such need of bread that I should work a miracle to get it. Life depends on the will of God. God is able to support it not by bread alone but by everything He will to employ as food. And this is the word of God. His commandments and His law, which men must obey, is a spiritual food of such a nature that it makes man forget bodily hunger, and he who feeds on this word does not feel the need of bodily food.'

"*Takes Him and places Him*" This does not mean that the devil carried Jesus through the air or that he compelled Him to follow him against His will, or that he worked any kind of wonder. There is nothing to make us think that the devil had such power or authority, and the word *takes* does not in anyway require us to accept one or the other of these explanations. It simply means that he conducted, or accompanied, Jesus, who went with him, not against His will, or because He was constrained to do so. The devil, when tempting the Lord to throw Himself from the summit of the temple, quotes a text from the

Psalms, declaring that, if He be in truth the Son of God, no danger can befall Him. For, if help is promised from God to everyone who puts trust in Him, much more shall such help be given to the Son of God, whose angels shall preserve Him unharmed. The essential point in this temptation lies in the idea that he could awaken in Jesus the desire to compel God, as it were, to work a miracle on His behalf, and thus induce Him to act under the influence of a feeling of spiritual vanity, pride, and self-will. 'If Thou be the Son of God,' the devil urges, 'God will do all things for Thee, and will work any miracle at Thy mere will.'

"*And He said to him*, etc. To these tempting words the Lord again replies with a text from Deut. vi. 16: 'Tempt not the Lord thy God. These words were spoken by Moses to the Israelites, warning them not to tempt Jehovah, as they had tempted Him at Massah, saying: 'Is the Lord truly with us or not?' and when the people clamoured for a miraculous supply of water. Thus the meaning of Christ's answer is: 'We must not ask or expect God to work a miracle merely to satisfy our capricious will. It is true, God helps all those who fear Him, and has promised to work miracles on their behalf, but only to save them from real danger, and not merely to satisfy their idle desire.' And in this way the tempter, when he dared to pervert the meaning of God's word, is confuted and put to shame by another text that gives the true interpretation of the words he had cunningly misquoted and misapplied.

"*A very high mountain*. We do not positively know which mountain is here spoken of. The words evidently refer to some lofty peak of a chain of mountains from which the greater part of Palestine could be seen. They

are generally supposed to refer to a certain peak that rises above all the mountains of Arabia, and from which are visible the land of Gilead and Jericho, the countries of the Amorites and Moabites, as well as the valley of the Jordan, and the whole region of the Dead Sea. This mountain is still called the Mount of Temptation. In the same way, Moses, before his death, ascended Mount Nebo, and the Lord showed him the whole of the Promised Land, from Gilead unto Dan, all the land of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah, as far as to the shores of the Western Sea, and the south, the valley of Jericho, the city of palm trees, unto Zoar. From this we learn that there were mountains from which the greater part of the land of Palestine and its neighbouring provinces were visible.

*"All the kingdoms of the earth"* We must suppose that the tempter showed them to Christ in some orderly, but to us incomprehensible, manner; and this supposition is confirmed by the words of Luke, *in the twinkling of an eye*, that is to say, in a vision.

*"All this I will give to Thee."* The tempter usurps to himself authority over all these kingdoms, as if they belonged to him, and as though he had the right to give rule over them to whom he would, a right and a power belonging to God alone. It is true, the heathen, for a time, were under the rule of Satan, and the corrupted inhabitants of Palestine were subject to his authority; but, none the less, in these words of the devil is expressed a proud and false claim to a power that belongs alone to God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, and in whose hands are all the kingdoms of the earth.

*"Fall down and worship me."* Claiming to himself

power and rule over the world, which properly belongs to God alone, the tempter demands that worship should be paid him in his quality as God: that is, he claims a religious worship in which should be expressed complete obedience and fullest homage. The temptation really consists in the suggestion that, in place of accomplishing His great work of ransoming men by His death on the cross, and establishing the universal and eternal kingdom of God, Christ should assume and take upon Himself kingly authority over the whole world. In a word, the temptation is directed to make Christ renounce his mission of redeeming and ransoming the human race as their Saviour and Messiah.

*"Then He says to him, etc.* As with the first and second, so with the third temptation, which is of a bolder and more insolent character than the other two, our Lord once more confutes the tempter with the words of Scripture, and, at the same time, by the mighty power of His speech, compels him to cease tempting any further: 'Get thee hence, Satan!' It is written in Deut. vi. 13 how Moses exhorted the people of Israel not to follow after the gods of the nations living around them; that is, they were not to worship the gods of the heathen: 'For thou shalt worship and bow down before Jehovah, the true God, and before none other.'"

Such is the orthodox gloss on the story of the Temptation. I shall now, by way of contrast, transcribe at full length, and word for word, the commentary of Reuss, the venerable writer of the Tübingen school of Theologians:—

"The subject-matter of this famous passage, which more than any other episode in the Saviour's career has

exercised the wit and learning of our commentators, is known under the name of the Story of the Temptation. This name, however, scarcely corresponds with the exact nature of the event related. For, whilst the second evangelist speaks but vaguely of a temptation that lasted forty days, the first of the evangelists confines himself to the detailed relation of three separate temptations, which took place after the forty days had already passed. Lastly, Luke combines these two narratives, and adopts them both.

“These textual variations do not, however, touch the essential portion of the story. The same may be said of certain other differences which we shall notice in passing, without attributing to them any real importance. Thus, Matthew alone says that the temptation was the reason why Jesus retired into the wilderness, the Spirit wishing that he should be tempted. The savage beasts, which are mentioned only by Mark, serve to give the idea of solitude in a more picturesque manner; nor are we obliged to believe in the reality of these fierce beasts. From the first two evangelists we gather that Jesus retired to a lonely spot, where he remained forty days, in order to give himself up to meditation, as the popular and ordinary interpretation would imply, on his future ministry. The text of Luke’s Gospel, as corrected by the ancient manuscripts, on the contrary, presupposes a long and agitated sojourn, without any interval of repose, and troubled by frequent assaults on the part of the tempter. There is, moreover, this remarkable discrepancy: the three separate temptations do not follow one another in the same order in the two Gospels relating them. All the commentators agree in preferring the narrative given by Matthew; and their reasons for doing

so are logically and psychologically so well founded that we are not called upon to treat of them at length. We shall only remark that they cease to have any absolute worth the instant we admit the historical reality of the facts themselves. Lastly, there is a difference in the concluding sections of the three narratives. Matthew gives us to understand that the tempter, having been repulsed with disdain, abandoned his purpose once for all: Luke, on the contrary, insinuates that he later returned to his task. This writer was, doubtless, thinking of the struggle he had to maintain during the whole of his ministry, or of his subsequent sufferings and death. Matthew adds that the vanquished fiend was immediately replaced by attendant angels, who, it may be deemed, were sent either to minister to his necessities, or to render homage to his holy victory. Mark also speaks of angels, but it would seem to imply that they waited on Jesus during the whole of his sojourn in the wilderness, keeping him company, and ministering to his wants, all which naturally excludes the idea conveyed by the other writers, of his fasting and hungering.

"All these differences, we repeat, touch only the accessory details. We have now to turn our attention to the fundamental trait in this story, which is unique in its kind, and has no parallel either in the Gospels or in the whole Bible history. But, first of all, we must clearly understand what meaning we ought to attach to the word *tempt*. In biblical language, in the Old and New Testaments, this word is employed in three different senses. Firstly, a man is said to tempt God when he desires to provoke, by a prayer of impatience, some manifestation of God's power, as, for example, a miracle; and as such a desire has always for its source a lack of con-

silence or a want of resignation to His will, the Scriptures uniformly declare it to be a sin. Secondly, God is said to tempt men when He puts their faith to proof by means of a calamity, plague, or misfortune of any kind; but as in this case both the means employed and the end pursued are equally beneficial, the apostles evidently concluded the term to be misapplied (Jas. i. 13), and in a later age the word was in this sense constantly replaced by the less objectionable term *to try* or *to prove*. Thirdly, a man is said to tempt another, when he tries to seduce him to the commission of some bad act. Now there can be no doubt that the facts related in the story of the Temptation do not fall under the first or third of these categories. The tempter does not seek to put the power of Jesus into action, and to force him to work a miracle for his own advantage: there is rather a moral conflict between the holy will of Christ and the perverse tendencies of the devil. This being generally admitted, we shall be able to show that the three writers intend to relate an objective and material fact: the encounter and dialogue between two distinct personages, one of whom was Satan himself, appearing in a visible form, in order to seduce and tempt Jesus to acts, the bare suggestion of which he repelled with energy and decision. First of all, when he has already miraculously passed a period of forty days without taking any nourishment whatever, and the physical necessities of his corporal frame once more make themselves felt, the devil suggests to him that he should satisfy and appease them by working a miracle. Jesus refuses to do so, bringing forward a passage from the Scriptures (Deut. viii. 3) which justifies him in maintaining his faith in God, and in hoping to find means of nourishment, even

when all ordinary resources have failed. 'God,' he says, 'is able to nourish me in any way that may seem good to Him; He has but to speak, to command, and, without any call on my part to interfere, the ordinary nature of things can be changed.' It is equally erroneous to translate this passage: 'Man can live by all things (edible) that have been created by God': i. e., 'I can nourish myself spiritually with the word of God, so as to have no need of material food.' In Luke's narrative, as revised after the earliest manuscripts, we do not find this phrase, and the sentence interpolated in the ordinary copies, *every word of God*, gives no plausible sense. The second temptation consisted in inviting Jesus to expose himself to imminent danger by precipitating himself from the summit of a lofty edifice in the belief and assurance that God would miraculously preserve him from hurt. We do not know what place the evangelists wish to describe under the term we have habituated ourselves to translate somewhat loosely as a pinnacle of the temple. It is doubtful whether they refer to the sanctuary itself, to the roof over which there was no ascent. The term probably refers to another edifice standing within the holy precincts on the eastern side, where Mount Moriah rose above the low valley of Kedron in the form of a steep, perpendicular wall. The tempter endeavours to persuade Jesus by recalling to him some words of the Psalmist (xci. 12), which he interprets literally. Jesus replies by quoting another text (Deut. vi. 16), which condemns every act of tempting God in the sense indicated above. Lastly, the devil brings him to a high mountain, from the summit of which he can see all the kingdoms of the earth and contemplate their grandeur, their power, and their wealth. All these he promises to



give him, on condition that he consents to serve the interests of their master and ruler, who is no other than himself. Jesus confutes him by simply invoking the fundamental principle of revealed religion, which forbids every ambitious desire. We cannot help remarking how the most seductive of the three temptations is overcome with the least effort and the sternest decision.

"There is something peculiar in the concrete form of these three temptations, particularly the second, the reason for which is not easily apparent. But essentially they are not without parallels in Gospel history. They recall to us the scene in Gethsemane, where Jesus said: 'Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?' or the scene at Golgotha, when the people cried out: 'If he be the son of God, let him come down from the cross'; or the words spoken by Jesus to the Pharisees: 'This generation seeks after a sign; but no sign shall be given it, save the sight of the prophet Jonas'; or, lastly, the answer he made to the people when they wished to proclaim him their king; 'My kingdom is not of this world.' But none the less the story of the Temptation, as handed down and interpreted by the evangelists, presents insurmountable difficulties, which it is our duty to point out.

"We shall not dwell on those difficulties which concern the mere framework of the story; such as, for example, the question under what form the devil appeared, how Jesus was transported from the wilderness to the temple, from the temple to the summit of the mountain, and thence back again to the wilderness; where is to be found a mountain sufficiently high to allow a man to take in at a single glance from its summit all the king-

doms of the earth; or other like questions which may come within the province of a commentator on the letter of the Scriptures, but which are mere trifles in comparison with the difficulties confronting the theologian. The latter is justified in asking at the outset whether Jesus recognised the devil. Whatever answer we choose to give,—the text positively declares that he did,—the idea of his being divine is considerably weakened; since, either he, who is God, did not recognise the being he had come on earth to destroy, or else he did know him, and yet, all the while, put himself, or found himself, in his power. But it seems to us impossible that the devil could have power over the son of God in a physical sense, and still less possible that the son of God would give him power and authority over himself in a moral sense, by consenting to follow the devil whither he chose to lead him, and entering into a kind of relationship with him in carrying out his design and purpose. In general, the idea of God being tempted in this sense is contrary to the most elementary notions of any religion worthy of being called a religion; and, nevertheless, the Scriptures themselves assert that the temptation was the end and aim of Jesus Christ's sojourn in the wilderness. It follows from all that has just been said that the story of the Temptation, as presented to us in the Gospels, is incompatible with the orthodox formula and conception of the divinity of Christ. We must further add that this conclusion is mainly justified by the devil being represented as proposing to Christ that he should adore him. Now, according to the teaching of the Church, Christ, that is to say, the second Person in the Trinity, is the creator of the devil, being the creator of all that exists. The devil, of course, knows this better

than anybody else. The claim to be adored by Christ is, therefore, not only a blasphemy, but it is an inconceivable stupidity. But the evangelists did not wish to write absurdities. They, consequently, represent Jesus being tempted as man, but triumphing over his tempter without hesitation or effort, in the completest and most decisive manner.

"But even from this point of view, which, we repeat, is the view adopted by the evangelists, there are still serious difficulties that cannot be explained away. For, even when we would escape the difficulties arising from our presumptive belief in the divine nature of Christ, our religious sentiment still refuses to admit that the temptation—that is to say, provocation to evil—could have exercised upon him any influence, however transitory or provisional, though it presented itself to his mind only in the shape of a question or hypothesis to be resolved.

"In truth, if evil were able, we will not say to obscure for an instant the moral lucidity of his mind, or furtively to influence his moral conscience, but, so to speak, merely to pass like a shadow before his eyes, and detract, but for a moment, his attention, the idea of his absolute holiness, which is an indispensable article of the Christian faith, is brought into doubt, or, to speak more strictly, is directly compromised. This is so true, that even some of the ancient fathers of the Church taught that the scene, on the temple and on the mountain could not have been real facts; since, were they such, we should be obliged to admit that Jesus had yielded to temptation up to a certain point, without resisting at the decisive moment. Modern writers have gone further, and, denying the objective external reality of the whole story, have preferred to recognise in it nothing more than an internal

subjective incident, an evolution of the mind of Jesus, a perplexed contemplation of the aim and instruments of his ministry, a purely psychological drama. But it were easy to prove that this unnatural interpretation, which, to begin with, is in absolute contradiction to the text, does not in anyway clear up the difficulty in question. On the contrary, if we substitute for the personality of the devil, the subjective thoughts of Christ, whether they be the products of a dream, or a vision, or a spiritual struggle, we do but affirm the presence in his moral nature of an element of feebleness, which is the less likely to reassure us, the more unusual the object of the temptation is represented to have been. In this respect, at least, it may be said that the ridiculous interpretation of rationalistic commentators, who represent the devil as an emissary of the Sanhedrim, better preserves the integrity of the character of Jesus. A large number of German theologians, despairing of ever being able to bring the Gospel narrative into accord with an orthodox appreciation of the person and divinity of Jesus, and convinced that not one of the various manipulations of the historical record hitherto attempted by different commentators can completely escape shocking our religious instincts, would have us accept the following specious interpretation:—‘What the evangelists describe as an historical fact had its origin in a parable related by Jesus to his disciples with the design of making them understand the difference between a false erroneous conception of the Messianic work, and the powers given to him who was to accomplish it, and his own true conception of it.’—The devil, the wilderness, the temple, and the mountain form the framework of the imaginary history; and at the same time we are

no longer confronted by the inevitable contradiction as to the forty days spent in the wilderness, and the two days, which, according to John, intervened between the marriage-feast at Cana and his sojourn on the banks of the Jordan. It has with reason been objected that, if we adopt this view, it will be the sole example of a parable into which Jesus has introduced himself by name, and, moreover, that it must have been ill understood by his hearers to have come down to us in its present form.

“ This is quite true ; but, in any case, unless we plainly declare it to be nothing else than a myth, we must admit the story to have been originally drawn up and put together by Jesus himself, and to have been communicated to the disciples with a didactic purpose ; so that, whether we regard it as a parable or not, it is the inner meaning of the story, its moral religious bearing, we have to seek. The opinion that may be passed on the historical accessories of the story is for every true Christian a thing of secondary importance. He will feel less interest in solving the questions we proposed at the commencement of our inquiry, than in learning how Jesus understood his mission, or rather, what means he intended not to employ in support of his ministry. His personal necessities, of which hunger is here but the individualised symbol, could not be to him a preoccupation, a care, or a directing motive of his acts. Equally impossible was it for him to secure vainglory among men by making a parade of the power that distinguished him from ordinary mortals ; and he would naturally forbear manifesting, merely for his own pleasure, and without any profit to others, the protecting power of the tie that united him to God : since he must have known the

difference between the healthy devotion of a man who sacrifices his life because he knows its value, and the rash folly of a man who endangers his life because he has no knowledge of its value and worth. Lastly, it was impossible that he could deceive himself as to the nature of the kingdom he was commissioned to found, or be ignorant that the worldly schemes and designs, into which the fantastic and superstitious hopes of his people were ready to lead him, so far from securing his true end, would make his mission to be the denial of God by the usurpation of an idolatrous homage, as despicable as it was blasphemous."

Réuss, like the Church, assumes that Satan is introduced into the story of the Temptation as an actual personage. But he gives no reason for this supposition. And it is in this supposition the whole error resides. From the entire context of the story it is evident that the writer, so far from representing under the name "Satan" an actual personage, does exactly the contrary. For if the writer had wished to represent a real being, he would have said something about his person, form, shape, and actions; whereas not a single word is said about his personality. The person of the tempter is alluded to only so far as is necessary for the full expression of Christ's thoughts and feelings. We are not told how he came to him, how he conveyed him from one place to another, or how he finally disappeared. The writer speaks only of Jesus Christ and of the enemy that is in every man, the cause and origin of the spiritual struggle, without which we cannot conceive the idea of a living man. It is plain that the writer wishes to express the thoughts of Jesus Christ in the simplest manner. For

this purpose it is necessary that he should be made to speak, but only he. And the writer accordingly makes him speak with himself; and one voice he names, the voice of Jesus Christ, and the other, the devil, that is, the deceiver, or tempter. According to the interpretation of the Church, we are cutly told that we must in no wise suppose the devil to be a mere voice, but that we must look upon him as an actual Being, though, as is usual with the Church when dogmatising, we are not informed why all this must be,—and most of us have accepted the theory without thinking; but why a man like Reuss has accepted it may require some explanation. To every man who keeps himself free from Church tradition, it will be clear that the words attributed to the tempter express the voice of the *flesh*, the adversary of the spiritual temper in which Jesus Christ found himself after the preaching of John. And this interpretation of the words, *tempter*, *deceiver*, *Satan*, which have all one and the same meaning, is supported by several convincing arguments. Firstly, the person of the tempter is introduced only so far as is necessary to interpret the spiritual struggle; nor does the writer add one single trait or characteristic of the tempter himself. Secondly, the words of the tempter express the voice of the flesh and nothing more. Thirdly, all the three temptations are identical with the ordinary inner wrestling of the spirit, common to the soul of every man. In what, then, consists this inner spiritual struggle? Jesus is thirty years of age. He counts himself to be the son of God. This is all we know of him up to the period in his life when he comes to listen to the preaching of John. John preaches that the kingdom of God has come into the world, and that to enter it we

must be cleansed, not only by water, but by the spirit. John does not announce any outwardly striking order of things. There are not to be any outward signs of the advent of the heavenly kingdom. The only sign of its approach is a spiritual, and not a bodily manifestation,—purification by the spirit. Filled with this spirit, Jesus retires into the wilderness. His idea of his relationship to God is set forth in what has gone before. He counts God to be his Father; he is the son of God; and that his Father may take up his abode in the world and in himself, he must find the spirit that is to purify the world, and by this spirit must he purify himself. And that he may try this spirit, he submits to temptation, separates himself from men, and withdraws into the solitude of the wilderness. In the wilderness he suffers from hunger. Together with the consciousness of his sonship to God and of his spirituality, is associated the human feeling of hunger and the human desire to eat. And the voice of the flesh says to him: "If thou be the son of God, command that these stones be changed into bread." If we understand these words as the Church understands them, that the devil, tempting the son of God, wished him to give a proof of his divinity, it is impossible to explain why Jesus Christ, if he could do it, did not change the stones into bread. He would then have given the best, simplest, shortest, and most convincing reply. If the words were designed to be a challenge to work a miracle, then Jesus Christ should have replied: "I do not wish to perform a miracle"; or should at least have made an answer that had something to do with the question; but Jesus Christ does not say a word as to whether he wishes, or does not wish, to do what the devil proposed;



but speaks of something else; nor does his answer refer to the tempter or the temptation. Instead of this, he says: "Not alone by bread shall man live, but by everything that proceeds from God." These words have nothing in common with the devil's mention of bread, and refer to something entirely foreign to it. From the fact that Jesus not only does not make bread of stones, which it is plain he ought not to do, and does not in his reply assert its impossibility, but answers in a vague and general sense, we may conclude that the words, "Command that these stones be changed into bread," are to be understood, not in their literal meaning, but as addressed directly to a man, and not to God. If the words be regarded as addressed to a man, their meaning is simple and evident. These words will then signify: "You wish for bread; then, take such measures that you will have bread, for you yourself see that bread is not to be obtained by mere words." And Jesus answers, not the question, why does he not make bread of stones, but the idea underlying the tempter's words: "Do you yield to the requirements of the flesh?" And to this he answers: "Man lives not by bread alone, but by the spirit." The meaning of this quotation, taken apart from its context, is vague and general. To understand it more exactly, we must remember the peculiar circumstances under which the words were originally spoken. For when quoting these words from the Scriptures, Jesus Christ assuredly employed them in the sense they bear in the book of Moses (Deut. viii. 3) whence they are taken:—

"All the commandments which I command you this day, strive to fulfil, that you may live and multiply, and may enter into possession of the land which the Lord

promised with an oath to your fathers. And forget not all the way which the Lord your God led you these forty years through the wilderness, that he might humble you, and know whether you will keep in your heart his commandments or not. He humbled you, plagued you with hunger, and fed you with manna, which neither you nor your fathers had known before, that you might know that man lives not by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord. Your garments did not wear out, nor did your feet swell, for all these forty years. And know in your heart that, even as a man chastens his son, so the Lord your God will chasten you. Therefore, observe the commandments of the Lord your God, and walk in his faith and fear. For the Lord your God shall bring you into a good land; a land flowing with water, with brooks of water and lakes that spring forth from valleys and hills" (Deut. viii. 1-7).

And so, in reply to the devil's words about hunger, Jesus answers by recalling the story of the Israelites, who lived for forty years in the wilderness and did not perish, and bids him know that "man does not live by bread, but by the will of God." "And as Israel put his trust in God, and God led him forth through the wilderness, so have I faith and hope in God," answers Jesus.

When Jesus had thus spoken, the devil takes him, carries him to the temple, and, once more repeating the words, "If thou be the son of God," bids him cast himself down.

These words have cost orthodox commentators much trouble to explain. In reality, they present no difficulty. The voice of the flesh, speaking to Jesus, is named the

devil, and consequently these words signify: "And in the spirit he was carried to the temple"; or, "And it seemed to him that he stood on a lofty pinnacle, and the voice of the flesh said to him," repeating to him the words he had already employed: "If thou be the son of God, cast thyself down."

If we adopt the Church interpretation, these words have no connection with what precedes, and signify nothing more than that the devil again challenges Jesus to the performance of a superfluous miracle. The words quoted from the ninetyeth Psalm, to the effect that "the angels will bear him up," are also unconnected with what goes before, if we follow the Church interpretation, and the whole dialogue becomes meaningless and aimless. The incoherency and senselessness of the Church interpretation arise from a misconception of the first words: "make bread of stones." These are understood as a challenge to perform a miracle, whereas they are a simple assertion of the impossibility to have bread where there is none; and the succeeding words, "cast thyself down," are in the same way supposed to be a challenge to work a miracle. But these words are in their spiritual meaning evidently connected with the first. And this connection is emphasised and made still more patent by the second sentence commencing with the same words as the first: "if thou be the son of God."

Moreover, in the second answer, the word *ὅτι*, *because*, which we find in the text of Luke, clearly shows that Jesus Christ's answer is not directed to the words of the devil, "cast thyself down," but to his own refusal to throw himself down. As before in the first, and later in the third temptation, so now, Jesus Christ does not say, "it is written," but "because it is written," that is,

he says: "I do not cast myself down, because it is written." With his very first words, the voice of the flesh wishes to show Jesus the falseness of his conviction that he is a spiritual being, the son of God. "Thou sayest thou art the son of God, thou hast come into the wilderness, and thinkest to free thyself from all carnal wants and desires. But carnal desires still torment thee. Here thou canst not satisfy them by changing stones into bread; and so thou hadst better go where thou canst find wherewith to make bread, or provide thyself with a stock, and bring it with thee, and eat of it, like other folk."

This is what the voice of the flesh said in the first temptation. And in answer, Jesus Christ recalled the history of Israel in the wilderness, and said: "For forty years the Israelites sojourned in the wilderness without bread, and were nourished, and were kept alive, because God willed it so. It follows, then, that men live not by bread, but by the will of God."

Then the voice of the flesh, representing to him that he was standing on a height, said to him: "If it be so, and if, being the son of God, thou hast no need to trouble thyself about bread, prove it by casting thyself down. Thou hast said, that everything is ordered, not by the care or labour of man, but by the will of God. This is true, and in the Psalms of David it is written: 'They shall hold thee up in their hands, and let no evil come near thee.' Therefore, why dost thou suffer? Throw thyself down. No evil shall come near thee, since angels guard and watch over thee."

Directly we give their true meaning to the first words of the tempter, and understand them to be, not a challenge to work a miracle, but a simple assertion of

the impossibility of having bread where there is none, these words in their turn become consequent and intelligible. The words spoken by the devil, "cast thyself down," are based on the trust Jesus professes in God; and in the following words from the Psalmist it is argued that, if a man is resigned to the will of God and lives by it, he cannot suffer, since angels watch over him. The devil, therefore, reasons, firstly, that, if a man believes he lives by the will of God, and not by his own care or labour, he need take no thought of his life; and secondly, that for the believer there can be no deprivation and suffering, no hunger and thirst; that he need only cast himself down, surrendering himself to the will of God, and angels will keep him unharmed. That it is the wish of the devil to imply that Jesus Christ even now could save himself from hunger, if he only believed in the will of God, by casting himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, is evident from the words of the tempter, and is further confirmed by the answer Jesus Christ makes concerning the temptation of Jehovah by the Israelites at Massah. In the words, "cast thyself down," the voice of the flesh argues, not only that Jesus is in error in supposing that man lives, not by bread, but by the will of God, but that Jesus Christ himself does not believe it, inasmuch as he refuses to throw himself down. If he believed life to be dependent on the will of God, and not on bread made by man, or on man's care and labour, he would not now in his hunger be careful for his safety; whereas he suffers hunger and still does not surrender himself all trustingly to the will of God. To all this Jesus answers by refusing to cast himself down; "for it is written: 'Tempt not the Lord thy God.'"

Jesus Christ once more answers in words taken from the books of Moses, and cites the story how the Israelites murmured for water at Massah-Meribah (Ex. xvii. 2-7): --

"And the people reproached Moses, and cried: 'Give us water to drink.' And Moses said to them: 'Why do you reproach me? Why tempt the Lord?' And the people thirsted for water, and they murmured against Moses, saying: 'Why hast thou brought us out from Egypt to slay us, and our children, and our cattle, with thirst?' And Moses called upon the Lord, and said: 'What shall I do with this people? They are almost ready to stone me.' And the Lord said to Moses: 'Go before the people, and take with thee some of the elders of Israel; and thy rod, with which thou didst smite the river, take with thee in thy hand, and go. And, behold, I will stand before thee on the rock in Horeb, and thou shalt strike the rock, and water shall flow out of it, and the people shall have to drink.' And Moses did so in sight of the elders of Israel. And he called the place 'Massah and Meribah' (temptation and murmuring); because the children of Israel had murmured, and because they had tempted the Lord, saying: 'Is the Lord with us, or not?'"

By this single reference to the story of the Israelites in the wilderness, Jesus answers both the arguments of the devil. When the voice of the flesh declares that he does not believe in God if he takes thought or care for himself, he answers: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." And when the voice of the flesh says that, if he believed in God, he would throw himself down from the temple, surrender himself to the care of angels, and thus free himself from hunger, he answers that he murmurs against no one in that he is hungry, as the Israelites murmured against Moses at Massah.

He has not lost trust in God, and therefore it is not necessary that he should prove God's love, and he can easily endure his actual state. The third temptation is the logical outcome of the first two. The first two begin with the words: "If thou be the son of God." The third does not commence with any such words. The voice of the flesh without any preamble says to Jesus, after he has been shown all the kingdoms of the world, that is, how men live: "If thou wilt worship me, I will give thee all this." From the absence of the introductory phrase, "If thou be the son of God," as well as from the whole turn of speech, which is no longer argumentative, but assumes that the man to whom it is addressed has been already convicted of error, we can see how closely connected this passage is with what has gone before, if only the preceding passages be understood in their natural sense.

At first the voice of the flesh argues and says: "If thou be the son of God and a spirit, thou needst not hunger, or, if thou hungerest, thou canst of thine own will change these stones into bread, and satisfy thy desire. But if thou hungerest, and canst not make bread of these stones, then thou art not the son of God, and thou art no spirit. But thou sayest that thou art the son of God in the sense that thou trustest in God. And this is also untrue; for if thou really trustest in God, as a son has trust in his father, thou wilt not endure the pangs of hunger, but wilt trust thyself to the power of God, and be not anxious for thy life; whereas thou art, forsooth, afraid to throw thyself down from this pinnacle."

To this Jesus Christ answers, that it is not fitting he should demand anything from God.

We shall later explain what Jesus meant by these

words: it is enough for the moment to point out that the devil did not understand their meaning.

The devil reasons in this way: "If thou wishest to eat, provide thyself with bread. If it were true that thou submittest in all to the will of God, thou wouldst take no care for thyself; but thou dost take care for thyself, and therefore it is not true." And the voice of the flesh triumphantly continues: "If thou dost not wish to provide food for thyself, then take no care for thy life; but this thou dost when thou refuseth to cast thyself from the pinnacle: and if thou takest care for thyself, why not provide food for thy nourishment?" The voice of the flesh, as it were, forced Jesus to acknowledge its power, and that we must all live the life of the flesh, and therefore it says to him: "All thy trust in God, and all thy hopes in him, are mere words; in reality, thou hast not thrown off, and wilt never throw off, the flesh. Thou wert, and art, a son of the flesh, even as all men are. And if thou art a son of the flesh, honour the flesh, and serve it. I am the spirit of the flesh." And he shows Jesus the kingdoms of the world. "Thou seest what I will give thee, on condition that thou servest me. Honour me, serve me, and all this shall be thine."

To this Jesus again answers in words taken from the books of Moses (Deut. vi. 13): "Fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and swear by his name."

These words were spoken to the Israelites at a time when they were enjoying all carnal blessings, and when there was therefore a fear lest they should forget God and forget to serve him alone.

The voice of the flesh is hushed, and the power of God enables Jesus Christ to withstand the temptation.



All that was necessary to be said has been said. Church commentators like to interpret this passage as representing the victory of Jesus over the devil. However we interpret it, there is, in truth, no question of any victory; and we can equally regard the devil or Jesus Christ as victorious. Neither on the one side nor on the other is there victory; there is nothing beyond the exposition of two radically opposed views or principles of life. And it clearly sets forth which principle was rejected and which principle was acknowledged by Jesus Christ. Both these expositions are striking, since all the philosophical systems, moral theories, religious creeds, and intellectual departures in life throughout the different periods in the history of the world, are fundamentally reflections of one or the other of these two views of life. In every serious debate on the meaning of life or on religion, in every spiritual struggle of the individual man, we find a reflection and repetition of the arguments advanced and refuted in this dialogue between the devil and Jesus, this controversy between the voice of the flesh and the voice of the spirit.

\* What we call materialism is nothing more than the inevitable deduction drawn from the argument of the devil; and what we call asceticism is the inevitable deduction drawn from the first answer made by Christ, that man does not live by bread.

The pessimistic teaching of philosophers like Schopenhauer or Hartmann is a development of the second argument used by the devil. If we put it into simple language, the argument will be of the following import:—

*Devil.* Thou art the son of God, but art hungry. Bread is not to be got by words. Whether a man talk

about God or not, his stomach asks for bread. If thou wilt live, work, and provide thyself with bread.

*Jesus.* Man lives not by bread, but by God. Life gives to man not that which is carnal, but its opposite, the spirit.

*Devil.* But if life gives not that which is carnal, then man is free from the flesh and all its requirements. And if thou art thus free, then throw thyself down from this pinnacle; for angels shall hold thee up. Subdue thy flesh, or slay it at once.

• *Jesus.* Carnal life is from God; and therefore we must neither murmur at it, nor lose our trust in it.

*Devil.* Thou sayest, "Wherefore need I bread?" but at the same time sufferest hunger. Thou sayest, "Life is from God and is in the spirit"; but at the same time thou takest care for thy flesh. All this, then, is mere talk. The world did not begin with thee, and the world will not end with thee. Look around on men; they lived before, and live now, in providing themselves with bread; and they lay it up, not for a day, or for a year, but for years; and not only bread, but all man has need of. And they take care that none shall slay them, protect themselves from harm, and see that none do them wrong. Live, then, like them. If thou wishest to eat, labour and work. If thou pitiest thy body, see that thou take care for thyself. Honour the flesh, work for the flesh, and thou shalt live, and it shall reward thee.

*Jesus.* Man lives not in the flesh, but in God. In the life that comes from God we must have full and constant trust. In that life we must honour God alone, and serve him alone.

In the argument employed by the devil, that is, the argument of the flesh, all is true and incontrovertible

from his particular point of view. And in the same way, the argument employed by Jesus is equally true and incontrovertible, if we regard the question from his point of view. The difference consists in this. The argument of Jesus Christ includes within itself the argument of the flesh. Jesus Christ accepts the argument of the flesh, and takes it as the foundation of his own argument. On the contrary, the argument of the flesh does not include within itself the argument of Jesus Christ, and is based on a false understanding of Christ's point of view. The misconception of Christ by the devil begins with the question and answer in the second temptation. The devil says: "If thou sayest thou canst live without bread, which is necessary to life, thou canst renounce all thy carnal life, cut thyself off from it, and cast thyself down from a height in order to destroy that life."

Jesus answers: "If I renounce bread, I do not thereby renounce God; but if I throw myself down from the temple, I thereby renounce God. For life is from God, and life is the manifestation of God within me, in my flesh. Consequently, to renounce life, to lose trust in it, shows that I have lost trust in God. And this is why a man may renounce all in the name of God except life, since life is the manifestation of the God-head."

But the devil does not wish to understand this, and, imagining his reasoning to be true and well founded, continues: "How is it thou mayst renounce bread, which is necessary to life, and mayst not renounce life itself? This is irrational and illogical; for if one may not renounce life, neither may one renounce anything that is necessary to life." And from this he argues

"If thou mayst not cast thyself down from this pinnacle, but must take thought and care for thyself, so must thou take care for thyself in everything, and provide thyself with bread." . .

Jesus answers that we cannot compare bread with life, and that there is an impassable superiority in the one over the other. And the argument employed by Jesus leads exactly to the opposite conclusion.

The flesh says: "I have implanted within thee the idea of the necessity of observing my laws. And if thou ~~thinkest~~ that thou canst renounce any of the carnal desires, as, for example, hunger when thou wishest to eat, do not therefore imagine that thou canst escape me. If thou abstainest from satisfying a desire, thou sacrificest one for the others, and that only for a time, but none the less thou livest in obedience to the laws of the flesh. Thou sacrificest one desire for the sake of the others, but the flesh itself thou dost not sacrifice; and for this reason thou dost not escape me, but wilt, like all men, ever serve me, and me alone."

And this undoubted truth Jesus adopts as the foundation of his reasoning, and, acknowledging in his first words its truth, examines it from another point of view. He asks himself "What is this necessity within me to obey the flesh, this carnal desire, and this inner struggle with the desire?" And he answers: "This is the consciousness of life within me." "What, then, is this consciousness of life? The flesh is not life? What, then, is life?" "Life is something unknown, but something unlike to the flesh, something quite different to the flesh." "What is it, then?" "It is something proceeding from another source." And, therefore, whilst acknowledging the truth of the first proposition, that there is flesh and

that there is the necessity of observing its laws, he argues to himself, that nevertheless all he knows of the flesh and its desires, he knows only because there is life within him; and this life is not from the flesh, but from another source, which is in opposition to the flesh, and is called God. Man lives, consequently, not "because he eats bread, but because there is life within him. And this life proceeds from something else, from God. To the second proposition made by the flesh, that, in spite of all this, we do not escape the flesh, that all the same we live only in so far as from a feeling of self-preservation we obey the flesh, Jesus Christ in reply develops the argument from his point of view, namely, that he takes care of his life, not for the sake of the flesh, but because it is from God, and because life is a manifestation of God. And therefore in respect to the first conclusion, that we must serve the flesh, he is at complete variance with the tempter, and declares we must serve only the spiritual source of life, that is, God. Jesus says: "Therefore we must serve (*λατρεύειν*), not the flesh, but God alone." The word *λατρεύειν* signifies *to work for hire, at forced work for wages*, and is used here not without reason. And we must take care to understand the real meaning of this word.

Jesus says: "It is true, I shall always be in the power of the flesh, which will always make felt its desires; but, besides the voice of the flesh, I know also the voice of God, which is free and independent of the flesh. And, therefore, in these temptations in the wilderness, as in all human life, the voice of the flesh and the voice of God will be in opposition, and I must, like a workman looking for hire, work for the one or for the other. Two voices call to me, propose to me to

work for the one or for the other; and, in reply to such contradictory proposals, I will strive to serve God, and expect my reward from him, that is, if in the struggle I only choose the service of God."

And the spirit wins the victory over the flesh, and Jesus finds this spirit, which shall cleanse and purify him, so that the kingdom of heaven may approach. It is in the consciousness of this spirit that Jesus Christ returns from the wilderness.

If we give to these two words, "God" and "Life," the meaning we have already assigned them, the words of Jesus Christ will become still clearer. To the first speech of the devil about bread, Jesus Christ says: "Man lives not by bread, but by intelligence." And to the devil's proposal, that he should throw himself down, he answers: "I cannot lose my trust in intelligence, and intelligence is always with me. It gives me life, and life is the light of intelligence; how then can I doubt intelligence and tempt it? And, therefore, I can serve only that which is the source of my life, and is my life itself. I honour intelligence alone, and serve it alone." Besides the spiritual signification of this passage in confirmation of the development of his teaching in Christ himself, it has also an expository signification in Christ's recognition and consciousness of God as intelligence.

In the beginning of this story of the Temptation, Jesus speaks of the Hebrew God, the Creator of all things, a Being apart from and outside of man, pre-eminently a bodily God.

"Thou canst make bread," says the tempter. And answering, though indirectly, Christ affirms that God is not exclusively a bodily God. "Man lives not by bread

alone, but by God." The words, "cast thyself down," that is, "if thou mayst deprive thyself of bread, thou mayst also deprive thyself of life," express a doubt that God is the source of life, and imply that life is not from God, and is in our power. And Christ, in answer, says: "All is in my power, except life; for life itself is from God. Life is the manifestation of God, life in God."

Thus, though from a different starting-point, we arrive at the same conclusion that has already been set forth: that life is the light of the world, and the light is Intelligence, and Intelligence is that which men call God, the beginning of all things.

In the third temptation the whole argument is transferred from the spiritual to the material sphere, and it is said: "Thy reasoning cannot be just, since all the world lives otherwise."

In reply to this, Christ repeats his conception of God as a spiritual, not a bodily being. He says: "Surrounded by blessings which I owe to Intelligence, I ought to honour my God alone, and serve him only." It must also be remarked that, in the further development of his teaching, this conception of God and of man's relationship to God is worked out on the same line of thought. We must not forget that it was in answer to the question, "By what does man live, by bread, or by God?" that Jesus for the first time expounded his doctrine as to the meaning of God and man, and that on many later occasions, when Jesus wished to define the true relations of man to God, he pursued the same train of thought, and made the same comparison, and the same reference to bread, as being the simplest and easiest mode of explaining his doctrine.

We shall, farther on, have an opportunity of pointing out how all the passages in which bread, food, or wine is spoken of, are in harmony and accord with the place of which we have been treating.

#### VII. VISIT TO THE MARRIAGE FEAST AT CANA

(JOHN II. 1-11)

The story of this visit to Cana, in Galilee, an event of which we have such a detailed description in the Gospels, is most instructive as an example of the harm done by accepting the mere letter of the Bible story as inspired revelation. The main incident in itself presents nothing extraordinary or instructive, from whatever point of view we choose to consider it. If we look on it as a miracle, the miracle is meaningless; to consider it a mere trick were to insult Christ; as a picture of daily life, the narrative possesses no value.

Matt. xiv. 3-5; Mark vi. 17-20, Luke iii. 19, 20; Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14; John iv. 1, 2; John iv. 44-54; Luke v. 1-10; Matt. iv. 19, 20; Mark i. 17, 18.

In the passages above referred to we find events described that have no bearing on the teaching of Christ.



## VIII. THE FIRST PREACHING OF JESUS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Matt. iv. 17: Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο<br>οἱ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν | From that time forth Jesus<br>began to proclaim |
|--|---|

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Mark i. 14: Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς<br>βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ | The kingdom of God; |
|---|---------------------|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 15 Κεῖ λέγων ὅτι τετελεσται<br>οἱ νόμοι, καὶ ἡγγίεν ἡ βασιτεία<br>τοῦ θεοῦ μετάνοιτε καὶ πιστεῦτε<br>ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. | And said The time has at-<br>tended, and the kingdom of God<br>has already come change your<br>lives and believe in the annun-<br>ciation of true happiness |
|---|---|

It is only said that, having seen Jesus Christ, John cried out: "He cometh after me but he was before me"; but he does not say whether he was the Christ. And therefore in this place, as also in subsequent passages referring to signs that were given to prove that Jesus was the Christ, we must distinguish the signs themselves from the teaching with which they are often connected. Whether Jesus, whose teaching has spread over the larger half of the world, was from the Jewish point of view the Messiah whom they expected, or not, is a question with which the teaching of Christ is not concerned.

To the Jews who embraced Christianity it might be a question of importance, and we can easily understand how the meaning of certain passages in the Gospels has been forced in the attempt to make them prove that Jesus was the Christ, that is, the Anointed One. In the same way as David and Saul were anointed, it was imagined Christ was anointed by John.

To us, who are not of the Jewish faith, and in no way

bound by the Jewish law, the testimony of John, that Jesus was the true Messiah sent by God, even if it ever were given, is, of course, quite superfluous and unnecessary.

John i. 19-34; Matt. iii. 16-17; Mark i. 10, 11; Luke iii. 21, 22. In these passages we find assertions and proofs that Jesus Christ is the son of God. For us, who are not Jews, it is a matter of no importance whether Jesus was son of God or not, in the Jewish acceptance of the term. If there were no other proofs of his sonship to God than that of a voice heard we know not by whom eighteen hundred years ago, this legend would probably convince no one of his election and sonship. All who understand the truth of Jesus and his sonship to God, as already explained in this chapter, must hold the legend of the dove and the voice from heaven to be, to say the least, puerile and unconvincing.

#### IX. THE FIRST DISCIPLES

John i. 35: Τῷ ἑπαυριον παύειν | And again John met Jesus,  
εἰσῆλθει ὁ Ἰωάννης, καὶ ἐκ τῶν  
μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο,

36: Καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ | And said of him: This is the  
περιπατοῦντι, λέγει. "Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς | lamb of God.  
τοῦ θεοῦ.

1. Ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι, *he saw Jesus coming towards him.* We must understand from these words that Jesus and John again met, when the former

was on his way to Galilee. The word *πάλιν* shows this. In general, events are described in John's Gospel very briefly, but it does not follow that nothing happened beyond what is related. Like a man relating a well-known story, the evangelist recalls only the more prominent and salient points in the narrative. It is plain that Jesus met John, and spake to him, and that after the conversation John said: "He is the lamb appointed by God." These last words sum up briefly and clearly all that John actually said.

John i. 37: Καὶ ἤκουσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦντος, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ | The two disciples of John, when they heard these words, went after Jesus.

38: Στραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ θεωρῶν αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας, λέγει αὐτοῖς | Jesus turned round, saw that they came after him, and said to them:

38: Τί ζητεῖτε; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί (ὃ λέγεται ἑρμηνεύμενον, Διδάσκαλε), ποῦ μένεις;<sup>1</sup> | What do you seek? They said: Rabbi (which means Master), where dost thou live?

1. Ποῦ μένεις; *where dost thou live?* The words of the disciples, the answer made by Jesus Christ, "Come, and see where I live," and the statement that the disciples went and saw where he lived, evidently imply more than is actually related. The Evangelist John merely records the more important parts of the dialogue, but the meaning of the whole passage evidently is, that the disciples wished to join him, to hear his teaching, and it may be to see his life, and he invited them to go with him; and they saw his life, and heard his teaching, and were convinced that he taught the truth.

John i. 39: Λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἐρχεσθε καὶ ἴδετε· Ἦλθον καὶ ἴδον ποῦ μένει· καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην· ὥρα δὲ ἦν ὥς δεκάτης.

He said to them: Come and see. They went and saw where he lived, and they spent the day with him.

40: Ἦν Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου, καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ.

One of these two was Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter.

41: Εὕρισκει οὗτος· πρῶτος τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εὕρηκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (ὃ ἵστι μεθερμηνεύμενον, ὁ Χριστός).

He sought out his brother Simon, and said: We have found the Messiah (which signifies the Lord's chosen one).

42: Καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Ἐμβλέψας· δε αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπε· Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάν· σὺ κληθήσῃ Κεφᾶς, ὃ ἑρμενεύεται, Πέτρος.

And he brought him to Jesus. Jesus looked on him, and said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which signifies a stone.

Mark i. 19: Καὶ πορεύας ἐκείθεν ὀλίγον, ἴδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννην, τὸν ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ ὄκτυα.

And going on a little farther from thence he saw James, the son of Zebedee, and his brother John. They were in a boat mending nets.

20: Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαίου ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν, ἀπῆλθον ἑπὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ.

And he immediately called them. And they left their father Zebedee, with his workmen, in the boat.

John i. 43: Τῷ ἑπαύριον ἤθελον· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐξελθὼν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ εὕρισκει Φίλιππον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.

Then already before he went into Galilee, Jesus met also Philip, and said: Follow me.

44: Ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ

Philip was of Bethsaida, of

Βηθσαιδὰ, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρίου  
καὶ Πίτρου.

the same village as Peter and Andrew.

45: Εὕρισκει Φίλιππος τὸν Να-  
θαναήλ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· "Οὐ ἔγ-  
ραψε Μωσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ οἱ  
προφῆται, εὐρόκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν  
υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ.

Philip sought out Nathanael,  
and said to him: We have found  
him of whom Moses wrote in  
the law, namely, Jesus of Naza-  
reth.

46: Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ·  
Ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν  
εἶναι; Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος· "Ἐρχου  
καὶ ἶδε.

And Nathanael said to him:  
Is it possible that anything good  
can come out of Nazareth?  
Philip said: Come thyself and  
thou wilt see.

47: Εἶδεν<sup>1</sup> ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθα-  
ναήλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ  
λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ· "Ἴδε, ἀληθῶς  
Ἰσραηλῆτις ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι.

When Nathanael came towards  
him, and Jesus met him, he said  
of him: Behold, in truth, a man  
in whom there is no guile.

# 1. Εἶδεν signifies here, met, came up to.

49: Ἀπεκρίθη Ναθαναήλ καὶ  
λέγει αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς  
τοῦ θεοῦ,<sup>1</sup> σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ  
Ἰσραὴλ.

And Nathanael said to him:  
Thou art the son of God, thou  
art the king of Israel.

The forty-eighth verse of the first chapter of John refers to some past incident well known to the writer; but the reference has no meaning for us, since we do not know what took place under the sycamore tree when Jesus first saw Nathanael, and I have therefore omitted it.

1. From the declaration here made by Nathanael that Jesus is the son of God, the title that Jesus Christ

claimed for himself in the wilderness, and king of Israel, a title implying that, as John had preached, the kingdom of God had come with Christ, we may suppose that John had spoken and conversed much with his first disciples. Nathanael understood the meaning of his preaching, and therefore said: "Verily, thou art the son of God, and thou art the king of Israel." The fiftieth verse has been omitted, since it is the continuation of a conversation about something unknown to us that took place under the sycamore tree.

51: Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἀμήν ἀμήν  
λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ὧς ὅτι ὄψεσθε τὸν  
οὐρανὸν ἀνεμύστα, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλ-  
ους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ  
καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ  
ἀνθρώπου.<sup>1</sup>

And he said: Know what is of more import than this, for I tell you the truth: know now, that heaven shall be opened, and the powers of God shall descend on the son of man and ascend from him to heaven.

1. Τὶς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *son of man*, both from the context and from its ordinary use, signifies, and cannot signify anything else, *man*, in the sense of the human nature and qualities common to us all. In these words Jesus Christ teaches what he had learned in the wilderness.

According to the ancient teaching, God is a separate being, existing apart from man. Heaven is the habitation of God, and God himself is hidden from man. According to the teaching of Jesus Christ, heaven is unhidden from man. The union of God with man is established. Human life is from God, and God is for ever united with man; and therefore the power of God descends on the son of man. Man feels this power within him, and

by its recognition is raised to heaven. In this consists the coming of the kingdom of God, which John first preached and Jesus afterwards confirmed.

#### X. THE PREACHING OF JESUS AT NAZARETH

Luke iv. 16: Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ, οὗ ἦν τιθραμμένος· καὶ εἰσῆλθε κατὰ τὸ εἰθὺς αὐτῷ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι.

And Jesus came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up. And he went, according to his custom, on the holy day into the synagogue, and began to read.

17: Καὶ ἐπέδωκε αὐτῷ βιβλίον Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου· καὶ ἀναπύξας τὸ βιβλίον, εὗρε τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον·

And they gave him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened it at the place where it is written:

18: Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ ἔνεκεν ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίζεσθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπεσταλκὲς με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφίσει.

The spirit of the Everlasting is upon me, and he has called me to announce happiness to the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to those in bondage, light to the blind, and salvation and rest to the weary (Isa. lxi. 1).

19: Κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν.<sup>1</sup>

To announce to all the year of the Lord's mercy (Isa. lxi. 2).

1. In the verse in Isaiah from which these words are taken, the prophet speaks of the Lord's vengeance. The passage in Isaiah reads thus: "To proclaim the year of the Lord's mercy, *the day of vengeance of our God.*" I quote this to show that any text taken from the books of Moses, or from the prophets, must be understood in the sense put upon it by Jesus Christ. So here, he selects the well-known words

which express his thought, omitting those that are inconsistent with it.

Luke iv. 20: Καὶ τὸ βιβλίον, ἀποδύς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισε· καὶ πάντων ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ.

And having closed the book and given it to the clerk, he sat down. And the eyes of all were bent upon him.

21: Ἦρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Ὅτι σήμερον πεπληρώται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὤσιν ὑμῶν.

And he began to say to them· Now is fulfilled this scripture in your sight.

22: Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτίσθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις, τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον. Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ;

And all were astonished at his gracious words, and said: Is not this the son of Joseph?

Mark vi. 3: Οὐχ οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ τέκτων;

And is he not a carpenter?

Matt. xiii. 55 Οὐχ οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; οὐχὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριὰμ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος, καὶ Ἰωσὴς καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας;

And is not this a carpenter's son? And is not his mother's name Mary, and the names of his brethren, James, Josès, Simon, and Judas?

Luke iv. 23: Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Πάντως ἐρεῖτε μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· Ἰατὰς, θεράπευσον σεαυτὸν·

And he said to them: Of course, you will say: Physician, heal thyself.

Matt. xiii. 57: Οὐκ ἐστὶ πρόφητος ἀτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

There is no prophet understood in his own country.

The exact meaning of these allusions to a prophet having no honour in his own country, or to the necessity



of a physician healing himself, is not very clear. In any case, this passage, as generally understood, has nothing in common with the teaching of Christ, and may therefore be passed over.

Matt. iv. 13 Καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρετ, ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν εἰς Καπερναούμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν, ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλιμ

And Jesus went down from Nazareth to Capernaum.

Mark i. 21 Καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασις εἰσελθὼν εἰς συναγωγὴν, ἐδίδασκεν.

And straightway on the Sabbath he went into the synagogue, and began to teach.

22. Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσαντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων,<sup>1</sup> καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

And they were in admiration with his teaching, for he taught them fully, and not like the scribes

1. Ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων signifies *having freedom*. Ἐξουσία in its primary signification means *freedom*, and in this place must mean *freedom*, not *power*, because it is put in opposition to the teaching of the scribes. The scribes had power, and therefore we cannot understand the words as meaning, "as one having authority, and not as the scribes," since they had authority. The contrast between them and Christ consists in this: they had authority, and therefore were fettered in their teaching, but Jesus Christ taught freely. According to the teaching of the scribes, men were counted to be the slaves of God and not free creatures; but, according to the teaching of Jesus Christ, men are free. If we understand the words in this sense, the enthusiasm of the people is intelligible. Had Jesus Christ taught with authority, that is, peremptorily and

overbearingly, which the Pharisees and scribes could do better than he, the people would have had no reason to listen to him with delight. But in his teaching there was a different spirit. And this difference of spirit was shown in that he taught *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων*, freely, like a man who is free from all shackling restrictions.

## XI. RECAPITULATION

Intelligence was incarnated in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ announced to men true happiness. The birth of Jesus Christ happened in this wise. His mother, Mary, was betrothed to Joseph. But before they began to live together as man and wife, Mary was discovered to be big with child. Joseph was a good man, and did not wish to put her to shame, and received her into his house as his wife. But he did not know her until she had given birth to her first son, who was named Jesus. And the boy grew in stature, waxed strong in mind, and was intelligent beyond his years.

Now, it happened that in his childhood, when he was already twelve years of age, Mary and Joseph went up to Jerusalem to keep the passover, and took the boy with them. When the feast was over, they set out for home, but forgot to see that the boy was with them. They afterwards remarked that he was not with them, and, thinking he had gone with some of his companions, began to ask after him of those they met on the road. But the boy was nowhere to be found, and they returned to Jerusalem to look for him. And on the third day they found the boy sitting in the temple with the teachers, asking them questions,

and listening to them. And all were astonished at his wisdom.

His mother saw him, and said. "What is this thou hast done to us? Behold, thy father and I have been sorrowing and looking for thee." And he said to them: "Where have you been looking for me? Is it possible that you did not know that a son should be locked for in the house of his father?" And they did not understand his words.

They did not understand that he, knowing that he, had no father by the flesh, counted God alone to be his father. And after this Jesus lived with his mother, and obeyed her in all things, and grew in stature and in wisdom, and was in favour with God and man.

And so he lived till he was thirty years of age. And all believed him to be the son of Joseph.

This is how Jesus began to preach true happiness. The prophets had foretold that God would come into the world. Thus Malachi prophesied: "My messenger shall go before to prepare the way for me." And the prophet Isaiah said: "A voice cries to you: prepare a way for the Lord in the wilderness, make his path even, that there be neither valleys nor hills, neither high nor low. Then shall the Lord be in the midst of you, and all shall find salvation."

And the words of the prophets were fulfilled when in the time of Jesus Christ there appeared a new prophet, John. John lived in the desert of Judæa in the Jordan. John was dressed in camel-hair, and wore a leathern girdle. And he fed on the roots of trees and on herbs. He called the nations to a new life. And the people confessed their faults to him, and he washed them in

the Jordan, in sign of purification from their errors. He said to them all: "Who has warned you that you cannot escape the will of God? Therefore, live the new life. And if you will live the new life, let it be seen by your works that you are changed in spirit." And John further declared: "Till now, the prophets have said: God will come. I say unto you: God is already come." He also said: "I purify you with water, but he who comes after me is stronger than I am, and shall purify you in spirit. When he comes, he shall purify you, even as a master purifies his threshing-floor; the wheat he gathers together, but the chaff he burns. If a tree brings not forth good fruit, the tree shall be cut down, and be burned for firewood. And the axe is already laid to the root of the tree."

And the people asked him: "What shall we do?" He answered: "He who has two garments, let him give one to him who has none. And he who has food, let him give to him who has not any." The tax-collectors came also to him, and asked: "What shall we do?" And he said: "Do wrong to no one. Do not cheat. Be content with what is paid you."

And he taught the people many other things concerning true happiness.

Jesus was then thirty years of age. He came to the Jordan to John, and heard him preaching that God is come, that men must change their lives, that now they will be purified with water, but that they must also be purified in spirit, and that this is the sign that God has come to them. Jesus did not know his father in the flesh, and counted God alone to be his father. He had faith in the teaching of John. "If it be true that God is my father, and that I am the son of God, what John

preaches is also true, and I need only to be purified in the spirit, and God will be within me."

And Jesus went into the wilderness to prove the truth of this, that he was the son of God, and that God would take up his abode in him. He withdrew into the desert, and, having sojourned there a long time without food or drink, was in the end hungered. And doubt came upon him, and he said within himself: "Thou sayest thou art a spirit, art the son of God, and that God will come upon thee; but thou art troubled because there is no bread, and God does not come upon thee: it cannot, then, be that thou art a spirit, or art the son of God." But he mused to himself: "My flesh longs for bread, because bread is necessary to life; but man does not live by bread, but by the spirit, by that which comes from God."

The pangs of hunger still continued to torment him. And now another doubt came over him, and he thought: "Thou sayest thou art the son of God, and that God will come unto thee; but all the same thou sufferest, and canst not stay thy sufferings." And it seemed to him that he was standing on the roof of the temple, and the idea came into his head: "If I am a spirit, and if I am the son of God, I shall not slay myself even though I throw myself down; for an invisible power will hold me up, protect me, and shield me from all harm. Why, then, should I not cast myself down? Why not put an end to my sufferings from hunger?"

But he reflected within himself: "Why tempt God, merely that I may know whether he be with me or not? If I tempt him, I do not believe in him, and he is not within me. The spirit of God gives me life, and the spirit of God is ever in my life. And therefore I

must not tempt him. I can refrain from eating, but I cannot kill myself, because I feel his spirit within me." The pangs of hunger, however, still continued to torment him. And again the idea occurred to him: "If I may not tempt God by throwing myself from the temple, neither may I tempt him by hungering when I wish to eat. I may not deprive myself of all the pleasures of the flesh. These are natural to all men." And it seemed to him that he saw all the kingdoms of the earth, and how all their inhabitants lived and laboured for the flesh, awaiting their reward from it. And he thought: "They work for the flesh, and it gives them all they have. If I work for it, I shall also have my reward from it." But he said to himself: "My God is not flesh, but spirit, in whom I live, whom I know to be ever within me, whom alone I honour, whom alone I fear, and from whom alone I await my reward."

Then the voice of tempting doubt was stilled, and the spirit stirred afresh within him, and he knew that God had come into him, and was ever with him; and knowing this, he returned to Galilee in the power of the spirit. And henceforth he knew the power of the spirit, and began to proclaim the advent and presence of God. He said: "The time has come; live the new life; believe in the annunciation of true happiness."

From the wilderness Jesus came to John, and remained awhile with him.

When Jesus left John, John said of him: "This is the true son of God, the chosen one of the Lord." Hearing these words, two of John's disciples left their former master, and went up to Jerusalem. Jesus saw them coming towards him, stopped them, and said:

"What is it you seek?" And they answered: "Master, we wish to be with thee, and to learn thy teaching." He said: "Come with me and I will teach you." They went with him, stayed with him, and listened to his words the whole day.

One of these disciples was named Andrew. And Andrew had a brother named Simon. After he had heard the words of Jesus, Andrew went to his brother Simon, and said to him: "We have found the chosen one of the Lord." Andrew took Simon with him, and brought him to Jesus. And Simon was surnamed by Jesus, Peter, which signifies a stone; and both the brothers became disciples of Jesus.

Before he came into Galilee, Jesus also met Philip, and bade him follow him. Philip was of Bethsaida, of the same village as Peter and Andrew.

When Philip had seen Jesus, he went and sought out his brother Nathanael, and said to him: "We have found the chosen of the Lord, the Messiah, of whom Moses wrote, even Jesus, the son of Joseph of Nazareth." Nathanael was astonished that the chosen of the Lord should be of one of the neighbouring villages, and said: "My brother, is it possible that the chosen of the Lord can come out of Nazareth?" Philip answered: "Come with me, and thyself shalt see and hear." Nathanael consented, and went with his brother, and saw Jesus; and when he had heard his words, he said to Jesus: "Yea, now I see it is true; thou art the son of God, and king of Israel."

Jesus said to him: "Know that which is of higher import than this, know that even now the kingdom of heaven is come, and therefore I tell you the truth, that the powers of God shall descend on all men, and from

them shall go forth the power of God. From henceforth God shall not dwell apart from men, but men shall be one, and united with God."

From the wilderness Jesus came to his native place, to Nazareth. And on the Sabbath, according to his wont, he went into the synagogue, and began to read. And they gave him the book of the prophet Isaiah. He opened it, and began to read in the place where it was written: "The spirit of the Almighty is upon me; he has chosen me to proclaim happiness to the wretched, liberty to the captive, light to the blind, and salvation and rest to the weary; to proclaim to all the day of salvation, the reign of God's mercy." He then shut the book, gave it to the clerk, and sat down, whilst all waited for him to speak. And he said: "To-day is this scripture fulfilled in your eyes. God is in the world. The kingdom of heaven is come; and all who are wretched and weary in heart, or in bondage, or blind, or forsaken, shall see salvation."

And many were astonished at his gracious words. But others said: "This man is a carpenter, and the son of a carpenter. And his mother is named Mary, and his brothers, James, Simon, Judas, and Joses, we know them all; they are poor men, even such as we ourselves are." And he said to them: "You naturally think that when I say the wretched and weary shall cease from among men, I say what is untrue, seeing I have a father, mother, brothers all poor, and that I should make them rich and happy. If you think so, verily, you do not understand what I say. Moreover, every prophet is without honour in his own country."

And Jesus went to Capernaum, and on the Sabbath came into the synagogue, and began to teach.



Now, all the people were astonished at his teaching, because his teaching was quite different to that of the scribes. For the scribes taught the law, and that we must all obey the law ; but Jesus taught that we are all free.

## CHAPTER II

### THE NEW LIFE: REJECTION OF THE JEWISH GOD

#### I. GENERAL REMARKS

THE negative definition of God forms the subject of our second chapter. John said: "When you are purified in spirit, the kingdom of God is already come." Jesus Christ went into the wilderness, learned the power of the spirit, returned to the world, and declared God to be in the world, and his kingdom to be established.

What is meant by the kingdom of God in the world, Jesus explained in his discourse at Nazareth in the words of Isaiah the prophet. The kingdom of God is happiness for the unhappy, salvation for the suffering, light for the blind, liberty for those in bondage. Jesus taught his disciples that henceforth, the kingdom of God being in the world, God will no longer be an inaccessible God, such as he was before, but that now he will be in union with his creatures. If, then, God be in the world and in union with his creatures, what kind of God is he? Is he God the creator, dwelling afar in the heavens, appearing from time to time to the prophets, and giving his law to Moses, a revengeful, cruel, terrible God?

In this chapter, then, we have the definition, as given

by Jesus, of what God is not. To understand this definition correctly, we must restore the true meaning of the words of Jesus Christ, since the Churches have done what they could to obscure their meaning. The true conclusion to be drawn from the words and acts of Jesus Christ recorded in this chapter, is that he denies all, absolutely all, the Jewish doctrine. This is so plain and positive that it seems impossible that it should be considered necessary to prove it. Unfortunately a strange fatality has forced the Churches in opposition to all common sense, to try to combine in one common creed two absolutely contradictory and irreconcilable systems—Christianity and Judaism. Hence the supposed necessity of maintaining an absurdity and perverting the truth. We have no occasion to study, it will be enough if we just skim the five books of Moses, in which all the acts of a man in some thousand varying and different circumstances are, down to the minutest detail, presented and defined, to be convinced that, in presence of such punctilious petty regulation of human conduct, there can be no possibility of developing or completing the teaching of the law. This might be possible, if it were once stated or allowed that all these laws and statutes were of human ordinance. But, on the contrary, it is plainly and positively asserted that all these legal directions as to how and when circumcision is to be practised, how and when the women and children of hostile tribes are to be massacred, or what restitution should be made for an or unintentionally slain.—it is over and over again asserted that all these laws were given immediately by God himself. How can such laws be developed or perfected? Only by new statutes more detailed and still more precise, as to circumcision, lawful murder, and the rest. But if

once we accept the law as inspired by God, we thereby deny ourselves the right of adopting the teaching of Christ, or any teaching that departs, however slightly, from the law. Everything is defined and prescribed, there is nothing to preach. In presence of the Pentateuch, the first word we speak will be a violation of and a departure from the Pentateuch. But the Church has tried to persuade itself and to persuade others, that the Pentateuch and the Gospels are both from God, and to do this, it has shut its eyes to patent facts and has played fast and loose with common sense. The Church has made this attempt to reconcile two irreconcilable things under the influence of the false teaching of Paul, which preceded a true knowledge of Christ's doctrine, and according to which the teaching of Christ was understood to be a development and complement of the teaching of the Jews. Now, when once this was done, and the question was, not to understand the meaning of Christ's teaching but to reconcile Judaism and Christianity, it was only natural that commentators should indulge in forced and mystic expositions, such as we find in Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, and such as for eighteen hundred years the so-called fathers and theologians of the Church have sought to impose upon us. What the result of such attempts must be we can imagine by supposing a writer to undertake the task of harmonising any one, say the tenth, of the volumes of the *Codex* of our Russian laws with the social teaching of Proudhon. And, in truth, the task of reconciling our laws and the teaching of Proudhon would be much easier than any attempt to harmonise the teaching of the Pentateuch and the Gospels. Let us cite a few examples of the difficulties these orthodox theologians have to encounter.

In the Gospels it is forbidden, not only to slay, but even to be angry with anyone. In the Pentateuch it is, kill, kill, kill, men, women, children, animals.

In the Gospels riches are an evil. In the Pentateuch riches are a blessing, the greatest happiness, a reward for piety and goodness.

In the Gospels purity of the body is insisted on: "Thou shalt have but one wife." In the Pentateuch the law is, take as many wives as you like.

In the Gospels all men are brothers. In the Pentateuch all not Jews are looked on as enemies, as Gentiles.

In the Gospels there is no outward ceremonial worship of God. In the Pentateuch more than one half of the five books is taken up with a minute programme of ceremonial worship.

And yet, in spite of all this, we are told that the teaching of the Gospels is a continuation and development of the teaching of the Pentateuch.

Of the false, and necessarily false, interpretation of Christ's teaching resulting from this futile attempt to reconcile Christianity and Judaism, in reference to other doctrines of the Gospels, we shall speak in the proper place; at present, we confine ourselves to ceremonial religion, against which Jesus preached and spoke.

According to the teaching of the Church, we are to suppose that Christ's condemnation of ablutions, and non-communion with the unclean; his denial that there are clean and unclean in the sight of God; his abrogation of fasts and of the sabbath, the chief covenant of the Jews; his discountenance of all sacrifices; his denial of the necessity of a temple made with hands; his judgment pronounced against Jerusalem, the holiest of all places in the eyes of the Jews; and lastly, his non-

recognition of God as an external being, and his conception of God as solely a spirit whom we must worship in the spirit,—all this, according to the Church, does not concern us Christians, and is but the condemnation of certain excessive formalities practised and insisted on by the Pharisees.

Now, passing over the fact that, if all this concerned the Pharisees, and no one else, an excessive and undue emphasis is given throughout the Gospels to what in that case is of very slight importance and interest, the idea that Jesus in all this was attacking, not the law of Moses, but merely the formalism of the Pharisees, must strike every man who can read and think as a forced, unnatural, and false interpretation of Christ's teaching.

Jesus, whilst condemning the law of the Pentateuch, of course, as will be readily understood, excepted those few truths which are to be found in what, for the most part, is a mass of extravagance and rubbish. Thus, for example, he retains and amplifies the law commanding a man to love his neighbour and to honour his father and mother. But because there are to be found some two or three phrases in the Pentateuch of which Jesus could approve, it does not follow that he developed and continued the Mosaic law; any more than a man, because he is at variance with the opinions of another, is obliged to reject every word he may speak and every opinion he may hold. It was not with the Pharisees that Jesus contended, but with the whole Mosaic law, and in his rejection of ceremonial religion he censured and condemned all that was included in the dogmatic faith of every grown-up Jew.

Let us briefly sum up the law as laid down in the Pentateuch regulating the worship of God by the Israelites:—

## OF PURIFICATION—

Lev. xvii 7 See that henceforth they offer not sacrifices unto their idols, after whom they adulterously follow

8 Say further to them If any of the house of Israel, or any of the strangers within your gates shall offer a burnt-offering or a sacrifice,

9 And bring it not for dedication to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation that man shall be cut off from amidst the people

Num xix 13 Whosoever touches the dead body of a man, and does not cleanse himself, defiles the tabernacle of the Lord let him be cut off from amidst the people of Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean, and his uncleanness is still upon him

14 This is the law If a man dies in a tent, anyone coming into the tent, and all that is within the tent, shall be unclean for the space of seven days

15 Every open vessel, that has no covering bound upon it, is unclean

16 Whosoever touches the body of a man that has been slain by the sword, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean for the space of seven days

17 Let the unclean person take of the ashes of a burnt sin-offering, and let him pour on them running water in a vessel.

18 And let someone who is clean take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle the tent, and all the vessels, and all who are in it, and him who has touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave.

19 And let him who is clean sprinkle him who is

unclean on the third day and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes and his body with water, and at even he shall be clean.

20: If anyone be unclean and does not purify himself, he shall be cut off from amidst the people of Israel; for he has polluted the sanctuary of the Lord; the water of separation has not been sprinkled upon him, and he is unclean.

21: And this shall be a perpetual law for them: Let him who sprinkles the water of separation wash his clothes; and he who touches the water of separation shall be unclean until evening.

22: And all that the unclean man has touched shall be unclean, and the man himself shall be unclean until even.

#### OF FASTS—

Lev. xvi. 29: And let this be a perpetual statute for you: in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, humble your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that is sojourning within your gates.

Lev. xxiii. 27: Also on the tenth day of the seventh month let it be a day of atonement, and gather together in a holy assembly, and humble your souls, and bring your offerings to the Lord.

#### OF THE SABBATH—

Ex. xxxi. 13: Speak thus to the sons of Israel: Observe my sabbaths, for they are a covenant between me and you, and your children's children, that you may know that I, the Lord, do sanctify you.

There is no occasion to quote the texts referring to sacrifices, since the greater part of the Pentateuch is



filled up with statutes and directions given by God himself, as to what sacrifices are to be made, and by whom they are to be offered

The same may be said of Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the city of the Lord. It is there that God dwells. From all the passages where God is spoken of, we see that God is represented, not as a spirit, but as an external separate being, with hands, eyes, and feet. And therefore when Jesus abolished all the rites of purification, fasts, sabbaths, and sacrifices, rejecting at the same time every idea of a bodily God worshipped in temples made with hands, he was not developing or continuing the Mosaic faith, but rejected it in its entirety, root and branch.

## II ABROGATION OF THE LAW OF THE SABBATH

Luke vi 1 Ἐγένετο, δὲ ἐν αββατῇ ὁ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διατρεφῆσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς σταχυὰς, καὶ ἠσθιον, ψάλλοντες ταῖς χερσὶν

It happened that on a sabbath day he went through some corn fields. And his disciples plucked the ears, rubbed them in their hands, and eat of the seed.

2 Τινες δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπον αὐτοῖς· Τί ποιεῖτε ὁ οὐκ ἐξουσιοῦν ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις;

And some of the orthodox saw them, and said to them: Why do you that which it is forbidden to do on the sabbath day?

1. The word *Pharisees* I replace by the *orthodox*, because it implies exactly what we understand by our word *orthodox*. The Greek word *Φαρισαῖος* is derived from the Hebrew *parash*, either in the sense of *exposition*—*ἐξηγητὴς τοῦ νόμου*,—for which the Pharisees liked to

pass themselves off, or in the sense of a man who holds aloof from the crowd of unbelievers, and counts himself to be orthodox. Among the traits peculiar to the Pharisees, it may be noted that, besides the Holy Scriptures, they acknowledged as binding oral tradition, *παράδοξις*, on whose authority a number of ceremonial rites were regarded as obligatory and of the greatest importance. They interpreted the Scriptures literally, and considered the due observance of ceremonial to be of higher import than the fulfilment of the moral law. They taught the dependence of man on God, but at the same time admitted to a certain extent his freedom of will. In all these points they are the exact counterparts of the orthodox of our own days.

Luke vi. 3, 4; Matt. xii. 5.

These verses contain an argument founded on the fact that David once eat of the shewbread to appease the pangs of hunger, and that the priests profane the sabbath. The argument can only be convincing for the Jews; for us its significance is considerably diminished by Christ's reference to the words of the prophet: "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." The only thing of importance in these verses, or at all applicable to ourselves, is this answer made by Christ. (See page 137.)

Matt. xii. 6: λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι  
τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστὶν ὧδε. 1

But I say unto you: Here is  
that which is greater than a  
sanctuary made with hands.

1. The words, ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστὶν ὧδε, I translate, *here is that which is greater than a sanctuary made with hands*, because *ἱερόν* signifies a dwelling for

*God, God's house on earth, a sanctuary.* It is not of the temple at Jerusalem that Christ here speaks, but the words refer to any sanctuary made with hands.

Matt xii. 7. Εἰ δὲ ἔγνωσκετε τι  
ἐστίν "Φαρισαῖοι θελω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν,  
οὐκ ἔν κατεδικατάτε τὸν, ἀναιτίους

And he said If you only  
knew what this means, I desire  
mercy, and not sacrifice, then  
you would not judge the inno-  
cent.

Mark ii 27 Καὶ ἐλάλεν αὐτοῖς·  
Τὸ σαββατον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπου  
ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἀνθρώπος διὰ τὸ  
σάββατον.

And he said to them: the  
sabbath is made for man, and  
not man for the sabbath.

28 Ὡστε κύριος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ  
ἀνθρώπου<sup>1</sup> καὶ τοῦ σαββατου.

And therefore man is lord of  
the sabbath.

*Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the son of man,* in this passage cannot be understood in the sense of a Person in the Godhead, since it is said that the sabbath is made for man, and not man for the sabbath, and the argument therefore cannot refer to another person, to the Son of Man, in the sense of God. *The son of man* has here the meaning it always bears in the Gospels, and signifies *man*.

The whole of this discourse, which had such a deep significance for those to whom it was first addressed, is of equal importance to us, if we would understand the real teaching of Jesus. In consequence of the false idea that Jesus handed on and perfected the law of Moses, this discourse is, for most commentators, nothing more than a dispute with certain Pharisees.

But for the unprejudiced reader the passage is of the

very highest importance, since from it he learns how Jesus, the very first time his teaching came into conflict with the Mosiac ceremonial worship of God, emphatically denied that it was any longer binding on men. The sabbath was the seal of covenant between the Lord and his people. The non-observance of the sabbath was a capital offence. The sabbath ordinances were then, and still are, in full force, and a large portion of the Talmud is taken up with laws and instructions as to how the sabbath is to be kept. The sabbath is to Jews what the Eucharist is to Church people. Just as he who does not observe the sabbath is no Jew, so he who does not partake of the Eucharist is an apostate from orthodoxy, or catholicism. To profane the sabbath and to profane the Eucharist are crimes equally heinous.

And it was exactly this sabbath which Jesus proclaimed to be a vain ceremonial invention of men, declaring that man is of higher import than any outward sanctuary, and that we should understand this, if we only understood the meaning of those words, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." He therefore taught that it was unnecessary to observe the sabbath, which was regarded as the first and chief of religious duties. As we may suppose, orthodox commentators are careful to hide the true meaning of this passage. This is what we read in the Archimandrite Michael's *Commentary on the Four Gospels* —

"Moses commanded us to work six days, and forbade all ordinary work, save what was absolutely necessary, on the sabbath, or seventh day (Ex xx 10, xxxv. 2, 3; Num. xv 32-36). The elders, by their oral traditional teaching, extended the sphere of the sabbath law, and taught that not even good works, or works of

charity, might be performed on the sabbath. But it must not be forgotten that the Pharisees, in their opposition to the Saviour, were, more punctilious in insisting on obedience to the sabbath law, where He and His disciples were in question, than in cases, where they themselves might be concerned. Consequently, when they saw His disciples plucking ears of corn to appease their hunger, an act of necessity, they did not fail to bring it to the notice of Jesus, and at the same time to accuse them of violating the sabbath day. This, further, gave them an opportunity of reproaching Him with permitting His disciples to commit what the faithful regarded as an open violation of the law of Moses, a violation that was likely to lead others into sin."

It is in this way that the true meaning of the passage is hidden and glossed over. And these Church commentators are obliged to do so to justify the orthodox creed.

The words spoken against the sabbath refer only to the outward ceremonial worship which the Church has established. But Jesus goes on to say: "Here is that which is greater than a sanctuary." The Church has manipulated the text and translated it: "Here is one who is greater." But even if we accept this translation, "one who," as is evident from what immediately follows, can only signify *man*. The Church commentators, however, would have us believe that Jesus is speaking of himself as God.

"In these words," writes the Archimandrite, "the Lord evidently refers to the greatness of His person as Lord of the temple." The temple, with all its sacred vessels, rites, ceremonies, sacrifices, was only an image or

type of the truth; but Christ is the truth itself, and consequently as much greater than the temple as truth is greater than its image or type. And, therefore, if it be allowed the priests and servants of the temple to perform these rites on the sabbath day without violating the law, still less guilty of its transgression are those who, being the servants of truth, from necessity plucked ears of corn and eat to the glory of God on the sabbath day."

By this interpretation Jesus is made the temple, and for that reason his disciples may eat on the sabbath day. The significance and meaning of Christ's words are entirely lost if we accept such an interpretation.

"Having justified the conduct of His disciples," continues the Archimandrite, "by bringing forward analogous examples from Scripture, the Saviour declares to the Pharisees that the cause and origin of their unjust condemnation of His disciples is their ignorance of the true relation between traditional ceremonial law and the moral law. The Pharisees did not practise that love and charity to their neighbour which God demands of us through the mouth of His prophet (Hos. vi. 6); but they turned all their attention to sacrifices, rites, ceremonies, and traditional forms, which only hid from them the source of true love. If they had understood that sympathising love is higher than tradition and formal rites, higher even than sacrifice, they would not have judged the innocent for plucking ears of corn on the sabbath day to satisfy their hunger. For He who is greater than the temple is also greater than any law preserved in the temple; and He who is greater than any law on the sabbath is Himself Lord of the sabbath. He whose mission it was to change the sabbath of the

old covenant can even now bid His disciples throw off the bondage of the old covenant; for the time had come when they must all learn by the spirit, and when He who, having freed Himself from evil, yearns for the attainment of all that is good, must no longer be under bondage to the law."

Such an interpretation is directly opposed to the express declaration, as recorded by Mark, that the son of man is lord of the sabbath, and that the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath; for man having made, can also abrogate the sabbath.

### III. HEALING OF THE WOMAN ON THE SABBATH DAY

LUKE xiii 10: Ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σαββάσι.

11. Καὶ ἰδὼν, γυνὴ ἦν πνιῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἐτη δέκα καὶ οκτώ, καὶ ἦν συγκυττουσα, καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παυτεῖλες.

12. Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἰησοῦς προσεφώνησε, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἰνναί, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου.

14. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι τῷ σαββάτῳ ἰθεράπευσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγεν τῷ ὄχλῳ· Ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰσὶν ἐν αἷς δαί ἔργαζεσθαι ἐν ταύταις οὐκ ἐρχόμενοι θεραπεύεσθαι, καὶ μὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου

Luke xiv. 3, 4: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ

It happened that Jesus was teaching in a synagogue, and it was the sabbath day.

And, behold, there was a woman there, and for eighteen years she had been possessed with an infirmity.

And Jesus saw her, and called her unto him, and said: Woman, be thou loosed from thy infirmity.

And the ruler of the synagogue was angry that Jesus worked cures on the sabbath, and said to the people: There are six days in the week wherein to work, in these six days come and be cured, but not on the sabbath day.

And Jesus turned to the people

Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους, λέγων· Εἰ ἔξεστι τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύειν; οἱ δὲ ἡσυχάσαν.

Luke xiii. 15: Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπεν· Ὑποκοιτά, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάττης, καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν πιτίζει;

16: Ταύτην δὲ, θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἔσθλην, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ οἶκα καὶ ἐκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἴδετο λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

Luke xiv. 6: Καὶ οὐκ ἔσχισαν ἀνταποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ πρὸς ταῦτα.

Luke xiv. 5: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπε· Γίνος ὑμῶν ὅπως ἂν βόυς εἰς φεῖαν ἐμπιστεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπᾷσιν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

Matt. xii. 12: Πόσω οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου; ὥστε ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν κατ'ὧς ποιεῖν.

dox and to the lawyers; and asked them: Is it lawful to help men on the sabbath day? And they knew not what to say.

And Jesus said to them: Hypocrites! will not each one of you on the sabbath day let loose his ass or his ox from the stall, and bring him out to drink?

How, then, not help this poor woman?

And they could not answer him this question.

And he also said to them: If one of you have a sheep, and he falls into a pit, will you not straightway drag him out, even though it be the sabbath day?

And, behold, a man is of more value than a sheep. He said: therefore, may we do good on the sabbath.

If there could be any doubt as to the ground on which Jesus Christ abolished the observance of the sabbath, the passage just quoted would be sufficient to clear up all difficulty on that point. Not on the authority of any pretended Godship did Jesus abolish the sabbath; that is to say, outward ceremonial religion, but on the authority of common sense, the authority of



the true intelligence of life, which became the beginning and foundation of all things. He says: It is contrary to sense, if we say that we may dig a heap out from a pit, but may not help or save a man, on the sabbath day. Of higher import than anything else is man and love to man. Every outward ceremonial rite can only hinder and blunt the fulfilment of the work of life, and for this reason ceremonial religion is not only unnecessary, but is hurtful. And he selected the observance of the sabbath which was regarded as the first and most important of religious ceremonial duties, and bringing forward an example to show how it hinders the due fulfilment of good works, rejected and abolished it. It would seem impossible to mistake his teaching. But as always, the Church has put its gloss upon it —

“The Lord gives a plain and unanswerable example of the injustice of the traditional teaching of the elders that we must do even a work of mercy on the sabbath day. If a man has one sheep—which will therefore be dearer to him than if he had a whole flock—and it falls into a pit on the sabbath day, and he thereby risks losing it for ever, will he not at once cry and drag it out from the pit? Of course he will, being moved partly by pity for the animal and partly by care of his own property. But a man is of more value than a sheep. If, then, we take pity on a dumb animal, and do good to it on the sabbath day, how much more are we bound to do good to and take pity on a human being—the image and likeness of God, to save whom, and to give everlasting life to whom, the Saviour was made man. The Pharisees could not doubt that we may do good works on the sabbath day, but so strong was the force of preconceived opinion, custom, and tradition,

that they were ready to deny what in their hearts and abstractly they acknowledged to be good and just. The Lord exposed their inconsistency."

"The Lord exposed their inconsistency" is a good phrase. But the Archimandrite, from whose *Commentary* the above passage is taken, forgets that the words of Jesus do not apply only to the sabbath, but to all ceremonial religion, of which sabbath observance is simply put forward as the most striking example. And though, of course, Jesus could not speak beforehand and directly of our church services, images, sacraments, and rites, for they were not then in existence, his words none the less apply to them.

To speak against sabbath observance is the same thing as to speak against our observance of the Sunday, the waste of money on the candles we set up before images, the salaries we pay to priests, the extravagant embellishment and decoration of our churches, and all the care we take about external ceremonial religion, which must always hinder works of love for the simple reason that care for ceremonial religion is directed, not towards the help of living creatures, but towards something that is dead; whereas works of love have for their exclusive object living creatures. No one can with truth allege that services, sacraments, litanies, and prayers do not prevent our doing good to others. They divert our activity from the living, from our fellow-creatures.

We must not forget that, according to the teaching of Jesus, every act in our life should have for its aim a work of love to our neighbour. How, then, can an act that diverts our activity from love for others assist us in the fulfilment of his teaching? To assert such a thing is the same as if a man were to declare that smoking

tobacco helps us to plough a field. It may be that smoking hinders us very little in this work, causes us to lose very little time, or even refreshes and enlivens us for the work. All this may be so, but we have no right to say that smoking in itself helps us to plough a field. And, if it in any way affects our work, it will certainly be to delay and hinder it.

#### IV THE CALL OF MATTHEW

Ματθ. ix. 9. Καὶ παρὰ τοῦ οὗρου. On c'en his way Jesus saw a  
 Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖθεν, εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθη- man sitting and collecting taxes.  
 μένον ἐπὶ τῷ τέλῳ, Ματθαίου. The name of this man was  
 λεγομένου, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ. Matthew. Jesus said unto him  
 οὕτως μοι. καὶ ἀσπασά, ἡκολούθησεν. Follow me. And he rose up and  
 αὐτῷ. followed him.

10. καὶ ἐγένετο, αὐτὸν ἀσπασάμε- And Matthew rejoiced most  
 νου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ, πολλοὶ for Jesus. Now, it happened  
 τέλῳ καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἔλθοντε that, while Jesus was sitting in  
 συναρκεῖντο τῇ ἰσχύϊ καὶ τῇ his house, there came also toll-  
 μαθήταις αὐτοῦ. gatherers and wanderers from the  
 fold, who sat down with Jesus  
 and his disciples.

1. Ἀμαρτωλοὶ *those in error*. I prefer to translate ἀμαρτωλοί thus rather than by the word *sinners*, because this term has acquired amongst us a peculiar and restricted meaning. The word ἀμαρτωλοί is here used in opposition to the word *Pharisees*, that is, people who count themselves to be orthodox, sole possessors of the true faith. We must therefore use the word which corresponds with the idea exactly opposed to *Pharisees*, and must understand, *those in error, those who have gone astray from the fold.*

V. ABROGATION OF OUTWARD CEREMONIES

Matt. ix. 11: Καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ  
Φαρισαῖοι, εἶπον τοῖς μαθηταῖς  
αὐτοῦ· Διατί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν  
καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν εσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος  
ὑμῶν;

And when the orthodox saw  
this, they said to his disciples:  
Why does your teacher eat with  
toll-gatherers and those who have  
gone astray from the fold?

Mark ii. 17: Καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ  
Ἰησοῦς, λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὐ χρειάζαν-  
ται οἱ ἰσχυρόντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ  
κακῶς ἔχοντες. Οὐκ ἤλθον καλεῖσθαι  
δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετα-  
νοίαν.<sup>1</sup>

And Jesus heard this and said:  
Those who are in health have no  
need of a physician, but they  
who are ill.

Matt. ix. 13: Ἦθελόν τι ἑστίν·  
ἢ μάθετε τί ἔστιν· Ἐλεον θέλω, καὶ οὐ  
θυσίαν.

I wish to preach, not to the  
orthodox, but to those who have  
gone astray from the fold.

1. Having rejected the chief and foremost ceremonial rite among the Jews, that is to say, the sabbath, and having shown that its observance is incompatible with true teaching, Jesus proceeds to show that it is hurtful, inasmuch as it leads people to think that, if they only fulfil the outward rites of their religion, they have made good their claim to be regarded as righteous and just. And counting themselves to be such, they fanatically avoid all communication or intercourse with those who have gone astray from, or are without the fold. And once more Jesus repeats that, not sacrifice, but mercy is required of us.

Mark vii. 1: Καὶ συνάγονται  
πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ τινες  
τῶν γραμματέων, ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ  
Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

And there gathered around  
him some of the orthodox and  
certain of the scribes, who came  
from Jerusalem:

2: Καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κοιναῖς χερσὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν, αἰτίτοις ἐσθίουσας ἄρτους, ἐμέμψαυτο.

3: Οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐὰν μὴ πυγμὴ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

4: Καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι· καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστὶν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμούς, πωτηρίων, καὶ ξιστῶν, καὶ χαλκίων, καὶ κλινῶν.

5: Ἐπειτα ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς· Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ σου οὐ περιπατοῦσι κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν ἐσθίουσι τὸν ἄρτον;

6: Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅτι καλῶς προεφήτευσεν Ἡσαίας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν· ὥς γέγραπται· Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσι με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

7: Μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

8: Ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, βαπτισμούς, ξιστῶν καὶ

And when they saw that his disciples eat bread with unclean, that is to say, unwashed hands, they began to murmur.

Because they themselves do not eat, unless they have first washed their hands, according to the tradition of the elders.

And also when they come from the market, they do not eat till they have first washed. And they observe many other like traditional customs, such as the washing of cups, dishes, pots, and jars.

Then the orthodox and the scribes asked him: Why do your disciples not observe the traditions of their forefathers, but eat bread with unwashed hands?

And he answered and said to them: Well did Isaiah speak of you, hypocrites, as it is written: These people honour me with their tongue, but their heart is far from me.

In vain do they worship me, teaching the learning and commandments of men (Isa. xlix. 13).

For you neglect the commandment of God, and observe instead the commandment of man, the

πατηρίων, καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλά ποιεῖτε.

washing of cups and glasses, and many like things you do.

9: Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσῃτε.

And Jesus said to them: You have cunningly set aside the commandments of God, that you may observe your own traditions.

10: Μωσῆς γὰρ εἶπε· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου· καὶ ὁ καθολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.

Moses said to you: Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He who speaks ill of his father or mother, let him be put to death.

11: Ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· Ἐάν τις ἄνθρωπος τῇ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ Κοριβαῖν (ὃ ἐστὶ, δῶρον), ὃ ἐάν τις ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὀφειληθῇς·

But you have devised that if a man shall say: All by which thou mightest be profited by me is *corban*, that is to say, a gift;

12: Καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῇ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ·

Such a man you allow henceforth to do nothing for his father or for his mother;

13: Ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παραδώκατέ· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλά πῶθετε.

You thus destroy the word of the Lord by your traditions. And many such things you do.

14: Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀκούετε μου πάντες καὶ συνίετε.

And he called the people together, and said unto them: Hearken unto me, and understand.

15: Οὐδὲν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵσχυροῦν ἐκείνον εἰς αὐτόν, ὃ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκπορεύοντα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκείνα ἐστὶ τὰ κοινῶντα τὸν ἀνθρώπου.

There is nothing that enters a man that can defile him. But what comes out of a man is that which defiles him.

16: Εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούειν.

If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.

17: Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς.

And when he had gone into the house away from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable.

18: Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε· οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐξώθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι;

And he said to them; Have you also not understood? Do you not know that nothing that enters into a man from without can defile him?

19: "Ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν· καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώναν ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα·"

For it enters not into the heart, but into the belly. And it goes out into the draught, purging every food:

20: Ἐλεγγε δὲ· Ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκείνο κοινῶι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

But what comes out of a man, is that which defiles a man.

21: Ἐσθθεν γὰρ, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, φόνοι,

For from the heart come forth evil thoughts, fornication, obscenity, murder,

22: Κλοπαὶ, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι, ὄλος, ἀσελγεία, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, βλασφημία, ὑπερηφανία, ἀφροσύνη.

Theft, covetousness, deceit, villainess, envy, calumny, pride, folly.

23: Πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσθθεν ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ κοινῶι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

All these evils come from within a man, and defile a man.

In Luke there is the following account:—

Luke xi. 37: Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι, ἦλθεν αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖός τις ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ· Εἰσλθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν.

After this, one of the orthodox came to Jesus, and asked him to dine with him at his house.

38: Ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμα-  
σεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ  
ἀρίστου.

And was astonished when he  
observed that Jesus did not wash  
before dinner.

39: Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν.  
Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν  
τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρί-  
ζετε· τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει  
ἄρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας.

And Jesus said to him: You  
who are orthodox wash the out-  
side of your cups and dishes, but  
your inward parts are filled with  
ravening and injustice.

40: Ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ  
ἔξωθεν, καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ποιήσας;

Fools! Did not he who has  
made the outside also make the  
inside?

41: Πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα ὅτε ἐλεημο-  
σύνην· καὶ ἰδοὺ, πάντα καθαυὰ  
ὑμῶν ἐστί.

Be charitable in your hearts,  
and then you shall see that all  
will be clean.

## VI. ABROGATION OF THE OUTWARD TEMPLE

John ii. 13: Καὶ ἔγγυς ἦν τὸ  
πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς  
Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

And the Jewish pas over was  
nigh at hand. And Jesus went  
up to Jerusalem.

14: Καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλῇ τοὺς  
πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ  
περιστεράς, καὶ τοὺς λερματιστάς  
καθήμενους.

And in the temple he saw men  
selling oxen, sheep, and doves,  
and money-changers sitting  
changing money.

15: Καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον  
ἐκ σχοινίων, πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ  
τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τὰ τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς  
βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεε  
τὰ κέρματα, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνεί-  
κλει.

And he plaited a whip of  
cords, and took it, and drove  
out of the temple the sheep and  
oxen, and straved on the floor  
the money of the money-changers,  
and overthrew the tables of the  
dove-sellers,

16: Καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστεράς

And said: Take these things



πωλοῦσι· ἔπειν <sup>1</sup> Ἀρατε ταῦτα· hence, and do not think that a  
 τεῦθε, μὴ τοιεῖτε τοῦ οἴκου του house of merchandise can be the  
 εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐμὸν· εἰς τὸν οἶκον house of my Father.

1 There ought to be a full stop after *πωλοῦσιν*, and before the word *εἰπεν* we must place *καί*. Otherwise it is impossible to understand why Jesus spoke only to the dove-sellers when he said "Take these things hence." It is plain that these words were addressed to all whom he drove out, and refer to all the things he overthrew.

Mark xi 16 *Καὶ οὐκ ἤρξεν ἵνα* And he did not allow any pro-  
*τις διενεγκῇ σκεῦος εἰς τὸν οἶκον* visions to be carried through the  
 temple

17 *Καὶ ἐδίδασκεν, λέγων αὐ-* And he ordered them and  
*τοῖς· Οὐ γεγραπται· Ὅτι ὁ οἶκος* said: Is it not written: "My  
*μου, οἶκος πρὸςευχῆς καλεῖσθαι* house shall be called a house of  
*πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑμεῖς, δὲ ἐτοι-* prayer for all nation? But you  
*μάτε· αὐτὸν σπ. ἡ αἰὼν Ἀμήν* count my house to be a den of  
 robbers.

1. *Ἐποίησατε* must here be translated, not *you have made*, but *you think, you consider*, a house of merchandise can be the house of my Father. It is difficult to suppose that in the very discourse in which he declares a temple to be unnecessary, Jesus would call the temple the house of his Father. He rather would say: "A house of merchandise cannot be called the house of God."

2. The words of the prophet Isaiah (lvi. 7) are here used in the same sense and with the same meaning as the words addressed in the following chapter to the Samaritan woman: "Take all this hence; for my house is not a house whither you bring sacrifices, but my house is the whole world, wherever people know the

true God." The quotation immediately following from Jeremiah (vii. 11), "and not a den of robbers," confirms this interpretation, as will be seen, if we subjoin the entire passage: "Believe not lying words when they say to you: 'Behold the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Everlasting.' But if you shall amend your lives, judge one another truly; oppress not the stranger, the orphan, or widow; and shed not innocent blood in this place: then will I preserve you in the land of your fathers from generation to generation. But you believe in lying words, that will bring you to destruction. For what is it you do? You rob and murder, commit fornication, lie, and serve Baal, and run after strange gods. And then you come to the house that is called after my name, and you say: 'Now, we may without fear commit deeds of filth.' How then? Is my house a den of robbers?" (Jer. vii. 4-11).

John ii. 18: Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Τί ση- And the Jews began to answer him and said: What proof of μείον ἔδεικνύετε ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα authority and right do you give us that you do such things?

1. Σημεῖον: *sign, token, a just proof.* I have translated it, *proof of authority and right.*

19: Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τούτον, καὶ ἐν τριῖν ἡμέραις ἐγ-παύω αὐτόν. And Jesus answered them and said: Destroy this temple, and in three days I will revive it.

1. Ἐγείρειν never signifies, and cannot mean, *to construct, to rear*; but it signifies *to revive*, and in this place this is its exact meaning, *to awake something living to new life*, and therefore we translate the word, *I will awake to new life.*

The meaning of these verses is generally explained by referring us to the twenty-first and twenty-second verses, and we are told that the temple signifies the body of Christ, and the three days signify the time that elapsed between his death and resurrection. This is in the interpretation sanctioned by the Church. Such an interpretation cannot satisfy those who, like myself, look upon the story of the resurrection as a ridiculous fable that destroys all the teaching of Christ, as will be pointed out in its appropriate place. Jesus Christ, therefore, could not be referring here to his resurrection in the body, since, as just said, that is an idea antagonistic to, and destructive of, his whole teaching. This interpretation is the later invention of men who themselves believed, and wished to make others believe, in the resurrection-myth. But the words which gave rise to this false interpretation were actually spoken, and, of course, had their particular meaning.

But why, when speaking of his body, should Christ use the word *temple*; and why, after having driven out from the temple the animals on sale for sacrifice, should he speak of the resurrection? We have only to forget the false interpretation put on the passage by the Church, and the meaning of the words will at once become clear, and serve as a natural explanation of what goes before. Jesus drives out from the temple all that is necessary for offering up sacrifices, that is, for public prayer, as the Jews understood praying, and, recalling the words of Jeremiah, he says we should do good to others, and not assemble in the temple to offer up sacrifices. Immediately after this, Jesus says, not conditionally, as is generally understood, but positively: "Destroy this temple, and I will make it alive, will raise it up anew."

He quotes from Isaiah and Jeremiah the passages declaring that the house of God is the whole congregation of people, wherever the nations recognise God, and that it is not a den of robbers; and then he continues: "Destroy this temple, and I will make for you a new living temple; I will teach and instruct you. And I will quickly make this living temple, because I have no need to build it up with hands. In three days, I will do what it took you forty-six years to do."

John ii. 20: Εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτην ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερσεις αὐτόν,

The Jews said. Forty-six years was this temple being built, and will you raise it up again in three days?

Matt. xii. 6: Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μέζων ἐστὶν ὧδε.<sup>1</sup>

And Jesus said to them: I tell you, here is that which is greater than a sanctuary.

7: Εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκατε τί ἐστιν· Ἐλεον<sup>2</sup> θέλω, καὶ οὐ θυσίαν.

If you only understood what this means: I desire mercy, not sacrifice (service in churches).

1. This verse, which occurs in the chapter relating how the disciples were blamed for gathering and eating wheat on the sabbath day, is quite out of place there, since there the subject of discourse is not the temple; but Jesus is there represented as saying: "Behold, here is that which is greater than a sanctuary." In any case, the idea expressed in this verse, and repeated in Matt. ix. 13, is a direct answer to the quibble of the Jews, and sets forth the teaching of Christ about the temple.

2. "Ἐλεον, fellow-feeling. I have translated it *mercy* (to one's neighbour).

After these words follow vers. 21 and 22 of John ii., in which we have the writer's fancy-explanation of Christ's answer.

John ii. 23 : Ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει.

And when he was at Jerusalem, during the feast of the passover, many believed in his teaching, accepting the proofs he brought forth.

24 : Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντα.<sup>1</sup>

But Jesus did not commit himself to them, because he himself knew everything.

25 : Καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν, ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκε τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

And because he had no need that anybody should testify of a man, since he himself knew all that was in man.

### 1. In many copies we find πάντα.

Mark xi. 18 : Καὶ ἠκούσαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, καὶ ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσουσιν· ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ.

And they sought how they might destroy him; for they feared him, because all the people marvelled at his teaching.

The following quotation from the Archimandrite Michael's *Commentary on the Four Gospels* will serve to give us the Church's interpretation of the expulsion of the sellers from the temple of Christ:—

"*And He found in the temple*; that is, in the courtyard of the temple, called the courtyard of the Gentiles.

"*A whip made of cords*: a symbol of God's anger at the desecration of the temple, and also a symbol of the

Lord's power, who was filled with zeal for the purification of His heavenly Father's house.

"*Take these hence.*" The doves were in cages or in baskets, and therefore the Lord, whilst driving out the dealers in animals, at the same time bids them take with them the baskets or cages of birds on sale for sacrifice.

"*Make not My Father's house a house of merchandise.*" Later, when for the last time the Lord came forth from the temple, He called it, not the house of His Father, but 'your house' (Matt. xxiii. 38), thereby announcing the abandonment of this temple by God. Now, however, He calls it the house of His Father, for the opposition of its servants to Christ and to God had not yet been openly manifested, and He still awaited the repentance of the people in the persons of their representatives.

"*House of merchandise.*" An expression less violent than the one used by the Saviour when a second time He purified the temple, on which occasion the Lord accused the Jews of having made the house of prayer 'a den of robbers' (Matt. xxi. 13). The vehemence of the second as compared with the first of these expressions enables us to understand how worldly gain and interests having once crept into sacred things gradually corrupted the whole service of the temple, and transformed it into sacrilegious formalism. If it be asked how it happened that these sellers submitted so quietly to the will and word of the Lord, that at His command they abandoned their merchandise and quitted the temple with all their goods, we may remark: Firstly, their consciences naturally told them that they were not doing well in thus profaning the holy place, and therefore when the Lord

with power reminded them of their sin, then conscience spoke to them still more strongly, and forced them to obey His command without a murmur. Secondly, the fame of Jesus of Nazareth as a prophet and man of God had already spread among the people, and pilgrims from Galilee had already brought to Jerusalem news of the miracles He had performed in Galilee, and of the wondrous signs that had accompanied His baptism, whilst the testimony given by John must have been still fresh in the minds of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the neighbouring places. Thirdly, the Lord on this occasion put forth His divine power, and thereby instantaneously overcame all human opposition.

*"Then answered the Jews.* It may be that by 'the Jews' we are to understand some of the sellers who had been driven out of the temple with their merchandise, but it is more probable that the words refer to the rulers of the temple, the priests and elders, who felt their authority to have been infringed by this arbitrary act on the part of a Galilaean and stranger. For, without doubt, the Lord by this act revealed Himself even to them in the quality of a prophet and special messenger from God, whilst the more thoughtful amongst them must have been struck by His calling the temple the house of His Father, and have had an uneasy suspicion that He was more than a prophet. And since Moses, Elijah, and the other great prophets had from time to time affirmed their high mission by working some extraordinary miracle, the Jews who surrounded the Saviour now demanded a sign from Him in witness that He had the authority and right to act as Lord of the temple and as the Son of God."

*"And said to Him, 'Give us some sign that Thou art*

the Son of God, and comest from God. For else, how can we know the Lord of this temple is Thy Father? Unable to recognise the sign He had already given them in His act of purifying the temple, and in the power He exercised over those who defiled the holy places with their merchandise, the Jews in their blindness demanded from the Lord another and more convincing proof of His power and authority.

"*Destroy this temple.*" The imperative mood is frequently used in place of the future tense. The evangelist himself explains the meaning of these words when he tells us that the Lord spake of the temple of His body (ver. 21); that is, he spake of His death by violence. In the same way His words: 'And in three days I will raise it up again,' refer to His resurrection on the third day after His death, and are designed to instruct His disciples in the doctrine of the resurrection (ver. 22). And so, to the demand of the Jews that He would give them some sign that He had authority over the temple, the Lord replies by revealing to them the supreme miracle of the resurrection, the crowning testimony that He was in truth the Messiah. Thus, at the very outset of His mission on earth as Son of Man, the Lord foretold the manner of His death and resurrection.

"*I will raise it up.*" In these words the Lord asserts His divine power, for no human being is able of his own will to raise his body from death. He does not say: 'My Father will raise up.' But He says: 'I will raise up.' For He needed not the power of another, but it was by His own power that He rose from the dead."

I shall now transcribe from Reuss his remarks on the passage we are considering:—



"In opposition to the disciples who believe, we have for the first time the Jews who doubt, who do not understand who refuse to believe. But, from being convinced by what they have just seen, they demand a sign, that is to say some extraordinary and miraculous proof that Jesus has the authority to act as he had acted. There had been something imposing even messianic, in his bearing and conduct towards the sellers in the temple, but they require a stronger proof and a distincter manifestation of his power. The answer made by Jesus in reply to their demand has excited bitter controversy among the commentators. According to the evangelist, this is what we are to understand from Christ's words 'Slay me, and on the third day I will rise from the dead.' In other words, the resurrection of Jesus is here foretold by himself as being the most striking proof of his divine dignity. And such it has always been regarded, especially in the writings of the apostles, from whose point of view this discourse presents no difficulty, and is perfectly intelligible. If it be objected that Jesus could not have spoken thus at a moment when no danger threatened him, when no serious conflict had as yet arisen between him and the pharisaical party, we must not forget that our Gospel is not a record of the slow and gradual evolution of events and incidents, but that, on the contrary, from the first to the last line, we have brought before us the antagonism between the world and Christ, between light and darkness, and that Jesus is never represented as having need to learn little by little that he has enemies to contend with, dangers to encounter, and that eventually he may be put to death. From the beginning he knows all that will happen inasmuch as his fate depends, not on the caprice of men,

but on the providential order of things designed beforehand. Nothing, therefore, can be more conformable to the spirit of our Gospel than the language here put into the mouth of the Saviour. The place, moreover, which the discourse occupies in the narrative is thoroughly natural. The scenes immediately concerning the disciples have been related, and the story of the work of the prophet now commences, and here the writer anticipates the chances of final success that lie before him. The world will be sought, but not gained over; it will be subdued, not by a voluntary submission, but by the condemnation it shall bring upon itself. It is thus the programme of the history of the world that we are about to read. These reflections will also meet the objection that the words of Jesus, as recorded and explained in the book before us, could not have been understood by the disciples any more than they were understood by the Jews. The same objection might be extended to nearly the whole teaching of the Saviour, for at the end of his career the disciples understood little more of the doctrines dealt of in this book than they did at the beginning. Jesus speaks, and the evangelist writes, for the Christian intelligence, and in no wise for the common Jewish people by whom he was surrounded. Nor must we lose sight of the circumstance that the evangelist himself expressly adds that the Jews misunderstood the meaning of the words spoken on this occasion by Jesus, imagining they referred to the material temple, the construction of which had been begun under Herod. But there is scarcely an episode, we had almost said scarcely a line, in the story of his life, in which this inability to understand the meaning of his words is not to be noted. It is the living, concrete expression of the fundamental

article in the theological creed of the evangelist, that the world is incapable of accepting or comprehending the great truths revealed to it from heaven."

Now, in the two extracts I have just made there is a great deal said about why the scourge of whips was made and how it was used but not a word as to what meaning we are to attach to a passage which, it must be remembered, is to be found in each of the four Gospels. According to the interpretation put upon it by all the Churches, it would seem to tell us little more than that on two separate occasions Christ took upon himself the police duty of preserving order and cleanliness in the temple whilst what it teaches us as contained in two verses,—the twenty-first and twenty-second, which I passed over,—where we have, not the words of Christ, but the words of an evangelist. These verses are supposed to mean that Christ will rise from the grave on the third day after his death. In them he foretells his death and resurrection. But, we may ask, was it not possible to make the prophecy at a more appropriate time and in a more intelligible form? For the incident here related has to do with neither the one nor the other. Christ came into the temple and cast out all that was necessary for its public services, in the same way as a man might come into one of our churches and cast out the host, the wine, the relics, the crosses, the altar-cloths, and all the other accessories of church worship. He is then asked what *σημείον* he can give? In no lexicon will the word *σημείον* be found to signify a miracle; but let us allow that this is its true signification here. What meaning is there in the demand made by the Jews? A man has overthrown and cast out all

that is required for the celebration of services in the temple, and he is asked: "What miracle wilt thou work, that thou doest such things?" The demand is, to say the least, unintelligible. The Jews might with reason have asked him why he did so, what he would put in the place of the things he cast forth, or what authority he had for thus acting. But with what propriety could they, instead of driving him forth, ask him: "Work us a miracle"? And it is still stranger that in his reply he does not say "I will" or "I will not work you a miracle"; but instead of this he says: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will make you a new living temple." If we accept the teaching of the Church, this means that the miracle he promises to work them shall be worked after his death; a miracle in which, when it was worked, no Jew believed. And we are further told that the words which Jesus spake and this miracle, that is, the miracle he promised to perform after his death, convinced them all, and that many of the people believed in him. We have only to take off the spectacles through which the Church reads the Gospels, to perceive that this discourse between Christ and the Jews, thus interpreted, is nothing more than the talk of madmen. But if we will only reflect a minute, and study the words of the Gospel with the amount of attention we should give to a second-rate novel, the whole narrative at once becomes clear and rational. We must, however, take care not to think that we are reading the composition of a mad dreamer, but rather commence our study with the conviction that the words—declared by the Church to be a direct revelation from God—have a meaning, and a meaning that is of no little interest and import to us all.

According to the teaching of John the Baptist, to

know God, it is necessary to be purified in the spirit. In the wilderness Jesus was purified in the spirit, and, learning the power of the spirit, proclaimed the kingdom of God in men. He taught his disciples the oneness of God with man.

The evangelist John teaches us that Christ's first act was the so-called purification of the temple, in reality, the destruction of the temple, and no other than the temple of Jerusalem, which was counted to be the house of the Lord and the holy of holies. Jesus comes into the temple, and overthrows and destroys all that is required in the celebration of its religious services. Not to repeat what has already been shown in our chapter on God—namely, that no one has seen or ever will see God,—and that Jesus has given us a new service in place of the old service, Jesus himself in the temple declares, in the words of the prophets, that the house of God is the whole congregation of the peoples of the earth, and not a den of robbers. What this really means we can understand by imagining some of our Spirit-Wrestlers to come into one of our orthodox churches, and, pulling down the altars, to cry out: "God is a spirit, and we must worship him in spirit and in our lives." And the Scriptures teach this so plainly both in words and in practice, that we have nothing to add, nothing to dispute. They tell us most clearly, both in words and in practice: "Your worship of God is a lie; you know not the true God, and your false worship of God is hurtful, and must be destroyed." This is exactly what the words and acts of Jesus in the temple preach to us. He rejects the Jewish worship and the Jewish conception of God. And in reply to his words and acts the Jews demand of him: "What authority hast thou to do this?" And he answers: "My

authority is that your worship of God is a lie, and my living worship is the truth. My worship of God is a living worship, a worship in works of love." And many believed in Jesus. The first thing Jesus preached was, then, the denial and rejection of the false visible God of the Jews. In the following chapter he teaches us that God is a spirit, and that we must worship him in our lives. And it is plain that, in order that men might believe in God as a spirit and might serve him, the false visible God and his false service must be denied and destroyed. And this is what Jesus did. It is impossible not to understand this. And if this passage has been misinterpreted by the Church, it is not from lack of understanding, but from over-wisdom. Such over-wise commentators are to be found in large numbers. And it is the Church that creates them by ordaining and sanctioning what Jesus has judged and condemned. And so in this case. Jesus denies a God-Creator and external God, and rejects all worship of God save worship in works of love. But the Church teaches that there is a God-Creator, and exists only to perform services and offer sacrifice. As an excuse for its existence, the Church is driven to sanction a false interpretation of the teaching of Christ.

All who would understand the Gospel must therefore bear well in mind that Christ's first act, before he began to preach, was the denial of an external God and the outward worship of God. The abrogation of the temple, as recorded by all the evangelists,—which is very seldom the case,—is a cleaning of the soil for sowing. Only after the rejection of the God hitherto served was it possible for Jesus to teach us about God, or how we are to serve him.

Indeed, the whole passage is but an exposition of the verse: "No man has seen, or ever will see, God."

## VII. DISCOURSE WITH THE SAMARITAN WOMAN

John iv. 3: Ἀφῆκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

And Jesus left Judaea, and departed again into Galilee.

4: Ἐδὲι δὲ αὐτὸν διέσχισθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.

And he was obliged to go through Samaria.

5: Ἐρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχάρ, πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ.

And Jesus came to a Samaritan city, called Sychar, near to the place which Jacob gave to his son Joseph.

6: Ἦν δὲ ἐκτὶ πηγῇ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς, κοποπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοπορίας, ἐκαθίζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ ὥρα ἣν ὥσει ἕκτλ.<sup>1</sup>

The well of Jacob was there. And Jesus was wearied with his journey, and sat down by the well.

1. Some trifling details, such as the hour of day at which the incident took place, as well as one or two unimportant sayings attributed to the Samaritan woman, have been omitted in the translation, that the reader's attention might be the better concentrated on the essential point of the narrative.

John iv. 7: Ἐρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλήσαι ὕδαρ· λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Δός μοι πιεῖν.

There came a woman of Samaria to draw water. And Jesus said unto her: Give me to drink.

8: Οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα τροφῶσιν ἑαυτοὺς.

For his disciples had gone away into the city to buy food.

9: Λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρεῖτις· Πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ πίνεις αἰτεῖς, οὗτης ἄνθρωπος Σαμαρεῖτιδος; οὐ γὰρ συν-  
χρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρεῖταις.

And the woman of Samaria said unto him: How dost thou, being a Jew, ask drink of me, who am a Samaritan? For the Jews have no intercourse with Samaritans.

10: Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Νεῖ ᾗδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι· Δός μοι πίνειν, σὺ ὅν ἤτλησας αὐτόν, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.

Jesus answered and said: If thou knewest the gift of God, and him who says to thee: Give me to drink: thou wouldst ask, and he would give thee spring-water.

11: Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ· Κύριε, οὐτε ἀντλήμα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν;

And the woman said to him: Thou hast no vessel, and the well is deep; whence canst thou draw spring-water?

1. The words, *εἰ ᾗδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν*, are to be understood to mean: "If thou knewest in what is the gift of God, and what God is." After the verb *ἐστὶν* a full stop should be placed, for Jesus then proceeds to tell the woman what God is.

John iv. 12: Ἴδὲ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ, καὶ αὐτός; ἔξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιε, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτοῦ;

Art thou, then, greater than our father Jacob? He gave us this well. And he himself, and his sons, and his cattle drank out of it.

13: Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν.

And Jesus answered and said: He who drinks of this water shall thirst again;

14: Ὃς δ' ἂν πῖνῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἄλλα τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω

But he who drinks of the water which I will give shall never thirst. And the water I



αὐτῷ, γεήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγή ὕδατος  
ἀλλοιμένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

will give him shall be a well of  
water in him springing up into  
everlasting life.

The fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth verses are of no importance. In them it is related that Christ divined that the woman had been married five times, and that the man with whom she was actually living was not her husband. These unnecessary details concerning the scandalous life of the woman only serve to weaken the effect of the narrative.

John iv. 19: Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή·  
Κυριε, θλωρῶ ὅτι τροφή-ης εἶ σὺ.

The woman said unto him: I  
perceive, Sir, that thou art a  
prophet.

20. Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν 'ν τούτῳ τῷ  
ὄρει προσκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε  
ὅτι ἐν Ἱερουσαλμοῖς ἐστὶν ἡ τοπο-,  
ὅπου δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.

Our fathers worshipped God  
on this mountain, but you say  
that in Jerusalem is the place  
where men must worship.

21. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Γύναι,  
τίστιν σοι μοι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε  
οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱερο-  
σολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί.

And Jesus said unto her: Woman, believe me, the time  
will come when you shall wor-  
ship the Father neither on this  
mountain nor in Jerusalem.

22: Ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ  
οἶδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδα-  
μεν· ὅτι ἡ σατράνεια ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων  
ἐστίν.

You worship whom you know  
not, but we worship him whom  
we know.

23: Ἄλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν  
ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνῇται  
προσκυνήσουσι τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι  
καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ  
ταῦτά τοις ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνῶντας  
αὐτόν.

But the time will come, and  
has already come, when the true  
worshippers shall worship the  
Father in spirit and in truth, for  
love, for the Father requires such  
worshippers.

24: Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός· καὶ τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. † God is a spirit, and we must worship him in spirit and in works of love.

25: Λέγει αὐτῇ ἡ γυνή· Οἶδα ὅτι· Μισσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα. And the woman said unto him: I know that the Messiah, who is called the Lord's Chosen, will come, and when he comes he will declare all things to us.

1. *Ἀληθεία* I have translated *works of love*. In many passages of the New Testament *ἀλήθεια* is used in the sense of *deed, work, act*. The word is here designed to show the opposition between an external ceremonial worship of God and the worship of God in act, or, works of love. If we adopt the ordinary translation, *spirit and truth*, we have an empty pleonasm.

John iv. 26: Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. And Jesus said unto her. I, who speak with thee, am he.

With the exception of vers. 32–38, which will be duly translated in their proper place, the passage immediately following ver. 26 (vers. 27–42) gives certain details that possess no general interest.

Jesus, whilst preaching the kingdom of God, which is the reign of love among men, traversed different villages and hamlets; and on one occasion, having come into Samaria, a land at enmity with the Jews, asked a Samaritan woman to give him some drink. The woman, on the plea that he was a Jew and she a Samaritan, refused him this simple act of humanity and love.

Most commentators in explaining the passage have forgotten to notice this peculiar trait, the woman's

refusal to give him water to drink, which none the less gives the key to the meaning of the whole story.

The woman declares that Jews can have no intercourse with Samaritans and for this reason refuses to give him to drink. Jesus then tells her that in so doing she deprives herself of the living water, the tie of love that joins man to man and that which alone gives true life. He further explains to her that he not only counts it no defilement to receive drink from her but that he is ready to touch her, in communion with all mankind, the lesson of regeneration by which she can obtain real and true life.

His answer to her objection that this he cannot do, since the Jews and Samaritans each have their own God or their own place of worship, as it were, at the same time announces the destruction of the temple. "The time has already come," he says, "when we must worship God, not in this or in that place, but everywhere, since we must worship, not a God whom we do not know, but a God whom we know, even as a son knows his father." That is to say, he repeats what has already been said, that no one knows God, but only the son has revealed him, as well as what is stated in the discourse with Nicodemus, that we speak that which we know and see, that only the son who came from heaven has revealed God. And in speaking of God he calls him "Father." And once more is expressed the idea that the teaching of Jesus is to do good, and he declares that the Father seeks such worshippers everywhere, worshippers in works of love and in spirit, since God himself is a spirit.

VIII. JOHN'S TESTIMONY OF JESUS

John iii. 22: Μετὰ ταῦτά ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἔχον· καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐβαπτίζεν.

After this Jesus came with his disciples into the land of Judæa, and tarried there with them, and washed the people.

23: Ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνῶν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ· καὶ παρεγίνοντο, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο.

And John washed them in Aenon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and the people came, and were washed.

24: Οὐπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης.

For John had not yet been thrown into prison.

25: Ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰουδαίων περὶ καθαρισμοῦ.

And a controversy arose between the disciples of John and certain of the Jews about purifying.

26: Καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ, ὃ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ἰδοὺ οὗτος· βαπτίζει, καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν.

And they came to John and said unto him: Master, he who was with thee on the Jordan, and of whom thou gavest testimony, behold, he too washes the people, and all men come to him.

27: Ἀπεκοίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν· Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν ῥοδὸν, εἰ μὴ ᾗ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

And John said: No man can take anything to himself, except he be taught by God.

28: Ὁ ἀνωθεν ἐρχόμενος, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστίν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ· ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν.

He who is from above, is above all; but he who is of the earth, will be of the earth, and will speak of the earth.

34. Ὁν γὰρ ἀπίσταιλεν ὁ θεός, ταῖς ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ.

He whom God has taught, he will speak even the words of God.

35. Καὶ ὁ ἐσώσατο καὶ ἤκουσε, τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν. ἰαμ. 3 αὐτοῦ.

And he who has attained and understood, will testify. And no man receives his testimony.

36. Ὁ ἰαθὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἐποφασίζεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστίν.

And he who has received his testimony, he has set his seal to this, that God is true.

37. Οὐ γὰρ ἡ κτίσις δύναται δοῦναι τὸ πνεῦμα.

For the spirit of God is not to be measured.

38. Ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ πάντα ἑδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

For the Father loves the son, and has given all into his power.

39. Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱόν, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ, οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.

He who believes in the son lives for ever, but he who believes not in the son, he is against God.

John had before preached that true purification is purification in the spirit. And now Jesus appeared and destroyed all outward forms, and preached purification without any temple, and even without water. And so there arose doubts as to what is true purification. And the disciples of John disputed with some of the Jews, and came to John to ask him. In general terms John declared what he had already said before, that the highest purification is purification in spirit, and that this cannot be transmitted by words. As to the question whether Jesus really spake the words of God, John answered that this no one can determine, that there can be no proofs as to what are the words of God. The one proof is that a man receives them. For it is not given us to measure the manifestations of the divine

## IX. JESUS AT SIMON'S HOUSE, AND THE SINNER

Luke vii. 37: Καὶ ἰδοὺ, γυνὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἣτις ἦν ἀματωλὸς, ἐπιγυῖσθα ὅτι ἀνάκειται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Φαρισαίου, κομίσασα ἀλά-  
βαστον μύρου,

And behold a woman of the city, who was not of the faithful, having learned that Jesus was sitting within the house of one of the orthodox, came thither, and brought with her a pot of ointment.

38: Καὶ στήσῃ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω, κλαίονσα, ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσι, καὶ ταῖς θοῖξί τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξίμασσε, καὶ κατηφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλειφε τω μύρῳ.

And standing behind him at his feet, she began to weep, and she washed his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and anointed them with the ointment.

39: Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ κκλησάσας αὐτὸν, εἶπεν ἑν ἑαυτῷ, λέγων· Οὗτος, εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ, ἣτις ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἀματωλὸς ἐστὶ.

And when the orthodox Jew, who had invited him, saw this, he thought within himself: If he were the true teacher, he would know who and what kind of woman it is that is touching him.

40: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς α Ἰησοῦς, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν· Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν. Ὁ δὲ φησὶ· Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ.

And Jesus turned round and said to him: Simon, I have something to say unto thee. And he said: Master, say on.

41: Δύο χρωφεύεται ἥσαν δαμιπτῇ τινι· ὁ εἷς ὤφειλε δηνάρια πεντακῷσια, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος πενήκοντα.

A certain householder had two debtors. The one owed him live hundred pence, the other fifty.

42: Μὴ ἔχοντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦμαι, ἀμφοτέροις ἵχαρίσατο. Τίς οὖν αὐτῶν, εἰπὶ, πλείον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσει;

And neither the one nor the other had wherewith to pay, and the householder forgave them both. Now, tell me, which of the two will love him most?

43: Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Σίμων, εἶπεν. Ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅτι ᾧ τὸ πλεῖον ἔχαρισται. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ὁρθῶς ἔκρινας.

44: Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, τῇ Σίμωνι ἑφ' ἡμέρας, εἰσελθὼν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβριξε μου τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς ῥιξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξε.

45: Φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ, ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον, οὐ διέλιπε καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας.

46: Ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἠλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρω ἠλειψέ μου τοὺς πόδας.

47: Οὐ χάριν, λέγω σοι, ἀφίονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς· αἱ πολλάι· ὅτι ἠγάπησεν πολὺ· ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ.

48: Εἶπεν ὅτι αὐτῇ· Ἀφίονται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

49: Καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ συνανακειμένοι λέγειν ἑαυτοῖς· Τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας ἀφίεναι;

And Simon said: It cannot be other than the one to whom most was forgiven. And Jesus said: Thou hast judged rightly.

And he pointed to the woman, and said to Simon: Behold I entered thy house, and thou gavest me no water wherewith to wash my feet. But she has washed my feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head.

Thou didst not kiss me when I entered into thy house; but she has not ceased to kiss my feet all this time.

Thou didst not give me oil to anoint my head with; but she has anointed my feet with costly ointment.

Wherefore, I say unto thee, she has freed herself from her errors, and they are great, for she loves much. But he who loves little, to him little is forgiven.

And he said unto her: Yea, thou art delivered from all thy errors.

And they who were sitting with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that frees men from their errors?

50: Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα. And he said to the woman;  
 Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην. Thy faith has saved thee; depart  
 in peace.

1. I propose the following change in the text of the forty-seventh verse. "Ὅτι, which now stands before the word ἡγάπησε, should be placed before λέγω σοι. The sense of the whole verse will then be: "Because I tell you her many sins are forgiven, she loves much. For he loves little, to whom little is forgiven."

The Pharisee was not pleased when he saw the sinful woman approach near to the teacher and touch him. Jesus said: "Behold, a man had two debtors; the one he forgave a large debt, and the other he forgave a small debt. How was it possible that the debtor to whom he forgave much should not show and express greater gratitude? Thou and this sinful woman, you are these two debtors; debtors to me, to the world, and to God. Thou reckonest that thou hast nothing to be pardoned, and thou hast given me no special proofs of love. She believes that she is guilty in the eyes of all, and before me, and before thee. And thou thinkest within thyself that she should not be allowed to touch me. But, behold, I have not driven her away; and even as I did not disdain to visit thee in thy house, neither do I disdain her; and for that she has declared her love to me. Because I have not reproached her with her sins, she has declared her love to me. Her sins are many, and therefore great is the love she declares. Thy sins are few, as thou thinkest, and little is the love thou showest, and little will therefore be pardoned thee. She believes that she is a sinner, and she is saved from her sins."



## X. PARABLE OF THE PUBLICAN AND PHARISEE

Luke xviii. 10: "Ἀνθρώποι οὗτοι ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν προσεύξασθαι· ὁ εἷς Φαρισαῖος, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος τελώνης.

11: Ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηύχeto· Ὁ θεός, εὐχαριστῶ σοι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἄρπαγες, αἰδικοί, μνηστοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης.

12: Νηστεύω δις τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδοικατὼ πάντα ὅσα κτάμαι.

13: Καὶ ὁ τελώνης μακρόθεν ἑστὼς οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπάραι· ἀλλ' ἔκρυπτεν εἰς τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Ὁ θεός, ἐλάσθητί μοι τῇ ἁμαρτωλῇ.

14: Λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος ὑποκατωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἢ ὁ κεῖνος· ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται· ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

(And Jesus said unto them:) Two men went into the temple to pray. One was orthodox, and the other was an unbeliever.

The orthodox worshipper thought much of himself, and prayed in these words: I thank thee, God, that I am not like other men, who are covetous, unjust, licentious; nor even such as this unbeliever.

I fast twice in the week, and give tithes of all that I possess.

And the unbeliever stood afar off, and could not even raise his eyes to heaven, but often smote himself on the breast, and cried out: Lord, look down on me, who have gone astray.

Behold, I say unto you: The unbeliever went away freed more of his errors than the orthodox worshipper. For he who exalts himself shall be abased; and he who abases himself shall be exalted.

The orthodox worshipper did not consider he had faults to be freed from, and therefore remained unfreed. The unorthodox worshipper, on the contrary, yearned to

be free from his errors and faults, and was consequently freed from them.

Matt. ix. 11: Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, λέγοντες· Διατί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν πολλά, αἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου αὐτὸ οὐ νηστεύουσιν, Then the disciples of John came to him and said: Why do we and they who observe the law fast often, and thy disciples fast not?

15: Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν, ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος; ἐλεύσονται ὅτε ἡλῶσαι ἔσται ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν. And Jesus said unto them: The guests at a wedding cannot mourn so long as the bridegroom is with them. But when the bridegroom is not with them, then shall they fast and mourn.

These words concerning the bridegroom are not very clear, as no explanation is given as to whom we are to understand by the bridegroom. According to the parable of the Ten Virgins, we are to understand under the word bridegroom, life: and, if in the passage before us we give this meaning to the word, the sense of the whole passage will be: "We have nothing to mourn for, so long as a man has life; but we are to mourn only then, when life is not within him."

#### XI. PARABLE OF THE NEW GARMENT AND THE NEW WINE

Luke v. 36: "Ελεγε δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἱματίου καινοῦ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μὴγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει, καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν οὐ συμφωνεῖ τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ."

No man will tear a piece off a new garment, to patch an old garment with the new; for the new will tear, and the old piece does not go with the new.

37 Καὶ οὐδὲι, βαλλεῖς οἶνον νεοῦ  
εἰς ἀσχοῦν. παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ, / And no man will pour new  
ῥήξει ὁ νεὸς οἶνος τοὺς ἀσχοὺς, καὶ / wine into old leather bottles;  
οὗτο ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ / for the leather bottles will burst,  
ἀπολυῶνται, / the wine will be spoiled, and the  
leather bottles will be lost

38 Ἀλλὰ οἶον νεοῦ εἰς ἀσχοῦν  
καίνοὺς βαλόντι, καὶ αὐφεσονται οὐκ ἁ- / But new wine must be poured  
ρουνται. / into new leather bottles; and so  
both will be preserved whole.

The meaning of the thirty-ninth verse of this chapter is not at all clear.

Luke iv. 33-37. These verses relating the expulsion of an unclean spirit, the spirit's acknowledgment of Christ, and the evangelist's renewed statement that the fame of Jesus had already spread abroad, may be omitted as unimportant.

The same remark applies to the following passages: Luke iv. 38-41, Mark i. 35-39; Matt. viii. 18; Luke viii. 26-40; Luke v. 17-26; Mark v. 22-43; Matt. ix. 27-34

## XII. THE PREACHING OF CHRIST

Luke iv. 14. Καὶ φήμη ἐξήλθε / And his fame spread abroad  
καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ. / all over the country.

15: Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς  
συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ / And he taught in their syna-  
πάντων. / gogues, and was highly esteemed  
by all.

42: Καὶ ἦσαν ὥς αὐτοῦ καὶ / And the people retained him  
ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ περιδοῦναι / that he should not depart from  
αὐτῶν. / them.

43: Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἀπέσταλμαι.

And he said unto them: I must announce the true happiness to others also, for I have been appointed to this.

Matt. iv. 14. "Ἰνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

And the word of the prophet Isaiah (iv. 1, 2) was fulfilled:

15: Γῆ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ γῆ Σιζδὰ λαῖμα, ὁδὸν θανάτου, περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνων.

In the land of the heathen

16: Ὁ λαὸς ὃ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει· εἶδε φῶς μέγα· καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χάσμι καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.

The people walked in darkness, and the people saw a great light. To them who lived in the darkness of death, even to them a new light has shone forth.

Matt. xii. 17: Ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

And so was fulfilled another saying of the prophet Isaiah (xlii. 1-4)

18: Ἰδοὺ ὃς ταῖς μου ἐκτίσας· ὃ ἀγαπητός μου· εἰς ὃν ἐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου· ἦθω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ κηρύσσει τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

Behold my child whom I love, my beloved, in whom my soul rejoices. I have put my spirit into him, so that he may proclaim the truth to the nations:

19: Οὐκ ἐλάλει, οὐδὲ καυχήσεται· οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ.

He shall neither strive nor cry, and his voice shall not be heard in the streets:

20: Κάλυμνον συντεταγμένον ὡς κατεσφίγναι, καὶ λίνον τυφέν· ὡς ὅταν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νύκτα τὴν ψαύειν.

He shall neither break the braided reed, nor quench the light when it is dim, so that the truth may triumph over the lie.

21: Καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἡ ἐλπίς πάντων.

And in him is the whole hope of man.

Mark iii. 7: Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνελθὼν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πολλὴ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας,

And then Jesus came to the places on the seashore, and multitudes followed him from Galilee, and from Judaea,

8: Καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ ἡ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα, πλῆθος πολὺ, ἀκούσαντες ὅσα ἐποίησεν, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

And from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and from beyond Jordan; and the people of Tyre and Sidon came unto him.

Matt. ix. 35: Καὶ περιήγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας, διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας.

And he went through the cities and villages, proclaiming in the synagogues the annunciation of the true happiness of the kingdom of God.

#### XIII. RECAPITULATION

To all men Jesus showed that then rather worship of God was a lie, and that God must be worshipped in spirit and in love to one another.

He happened once on a sabbath day to be passing through a field with his disciples. And on their way his disciples plucked some ears of corn, rubbed them in their hands, and eat of the seed.

When certain Pharisees and lawyers saw this, they said: "It is not right to do such things on the sabbath. No work may be done on the sabbath. But you rub ears of corn in your hands." Jesus heard them speak thus, and said unto them: "If you only understood what was meant by these words, which God spake to

his prophet, 'I take delight in the love men bear to one another, and not in the sacrifices they bring to me,' you would not judge the innocent. The sabbath was instituted, not by God, but by men, and therefore man is greater and of more import than the sabbath."

On another sabbath day it happened that, whilst Jesus was teaching in one of the synagogues, a sick woman came to him, and prayed him to help her.

And Jesus began to cure her. Then the elder of the synagogue was angry with Jesus that he did so, and said to the people: "It is written in the law: 'There are six days in the week wherein a man may work: but God has commanded there should no work be done on the sabbath day.' " Whereupon Jesus asked the lawyers and Pharisees: "Is it then, according to your law, wrong to help a man on the sabbath?" And they did not know what answer to make.

Then Jesus said: "Does not each one of you loose his cattle from the stall and lead him to watering on the sabbath? Or if a man's sheep fall into a well, will he not run to drag him out, even though it be on the sabbath? But a man is worth more than a sheep. And yet you say no help must be given to a man. Which, according to your law, is it right to do on the sabbath, good or evil, to save life or to destroy life? We should always do good, nor must we refrain therefrom even on the sabbath."

Now, certain lawyers and Pharisees came to Jesus from Jerusalem. And they saw how both he and his disciples eat bread in common with unwashed hands. And the lawyers began to judge him for this, because they themselves strictly observed the old law concerning the washing of dishes, and would not eat or drink out

of an unwashed vessel. Also when they came from market they refused to eat till they had washed. The lawyers therefore asked him: "Why do you not observe the traditions, and why do you eat bread with unwashed hands?" And he said to them: "The prophet Isaiah spake truly of you. 'The Lord said to him: Inasmuch as this people serve me only in words, and honour me only with their tongue, whilst their heart is far from me, and their fear toward me is nothing more than the precepts of men, which they have learned by rote, I will therefore do a marvellous and extraordinary thing among this people. For the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the reason of their intelligent men shall be dimmed. Woe unto them who strive to hide their desires from the Everlasting, and whose deeds are done in darkness!' And so you neglect that which is important in the law, the commandments of God, and observe only precepts of human invention, the washing of dishes. Moses said unto you: 'Honour thy father and thy mother; and he who honours not his father and mother, let him be put to death.' But you have devised that if a man say, 'I give to God that which my parents might have received from me,' he is not bound to support his father and mother. And many like things you do." And Jesus called all the people to him and said: "Hearken and understand: Nothing entering into a man defiles him, but that which comes out of a man. Let there be but love and mercy in your souls, and all will be clean and pure within you."

When he returned home, his disciples asked him the meaning of these words. And he said: "Can it be that you have not understood? Do you not then

understand that what is merely outward, of the flesh, cannot defile a man, since it enters not into the soul, but into the belly. It enters into the belly, and is then cast out into the draught. But that which comes out of a man, defiles him. For from the soul of man come forth fornication, ribaldry, murder, theft, covetousness, anger, deceit, insolence, envy, pride, and every ill. All that is evil comes forth from a man, and it is that alone which can defile him."

Jesus taught the people that a new life had begun, that God is in the world amongst us. This he taught them all; and he told his disciples that between man and God there is a close and constant communion. This he teaches us all. And all who heard him were astonished, because he taught not as the lawyers and scribes. For they taught the people that they must obey the laws of God, but he taught the people that they were free.

After this the time of the Passover drew near, and Jesus came up to Jerusalem, and entered into the temple.

In and near the entrances to the temple there stood for sale herds of cattle, cows, oxen, and sheep; there were also cages with doves; and the money-changers had their counters there. All this was necessary for the sacrifices that were offered up. The cattle were slaughtered and the doves were strangled for the temple, and money was given and exchanged. In this consisted the Jewish temple-service.

When Jesus had come into the temple, he made a scourge of cords, and drove the cattle away, let loose all the doves, and overthrew the money-tables. And he commanded that none of these things should be



carried into the temple. He said: "Behold, the prophet Isaiah told you: 'The house of the Lord is not the temple at Jerusalem, but God's people throughout the whole world.' And the prophet Jeremiah also said: 'Believe not lying words, when they say: Behold the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Everlasting. Believe them not, but amend your lives; judge not falsely; oppress not the stranger, the widow, or the orphan; shed not innocent blood; and come not into the house called after the name of the Lord, saying: Now, we may without fear commit deeds of filth. Make not of my house a den of robbers.'"

Then the Jews contended with him and said to him: "If thou forbiddest our service and mode of worship, what service wilt thou give us in its place?" And Jesus, turning to them, said: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise a new living temple to the Lord." And the Jews said: "How wilt thou immediately rear up a new temple, when this took forty-six years to build?" But Jesus said: "I speak of that which is greater than the temple. Nor would you ask this, if you understood the meaning of these words of the prophet: 'I, the Lord, take no delight in your sacrifices, but in the love of a man to his fellow-man.' The living temple is the whole congregation of the nations of the world bound together by the tie of love." And many of the people at Jerusalem believed in the words he spake. But he himself did not believe in that which is outward and external, since he knew all that is in the heart of man. Nor had he need that any should teach him concerning man, because he knew that the spirit of God is in man. And the elders and lawyers heard all these words, and sought how they

might destroy him; but they feared him, because all the people marvelled at his teaching.

Then Jesus returned again from Judaea into Galilee. And he had to go through Samaria. He passed by Sychar, a Samaritan village that lies near to the place which Jacob gave Joseph his son. There is a well called the well of Jacob. Jesus was worn out with his journey, and sat down by this well. And his disciples had gone into the city to buy bread.

Now, a woman of Sychar chanced to come to the well to draw water. Jesus asked her to give him to drink. But she answered him and said: "How is it that thou askest drink of me, seeing that you Jews have no intercourse with us Samaritans?" And he said to her: "If you only knew who I am, and what it is I teach, you would not speak thus: but you would give me to drink, and I would give you in return living water. He who drinks of this water will be thirsty again; but he who drinks of the water I give him shall have his thirst quenched for ever, and the water I give shall bring him to everlasting life." The woman understood that he spake of something divine, and answered him: "I perceive that thou art a prophet, and wishest to teach me; but how canst thou teach me the truth of God, seeing thou art a Jew and I am a Samaritan?"

Our people pray to God on this mountain, and you Jews say that men must worship God in Jerusalem. And therefore thou canst not teach me divine truth, since you worship one God and we worship another." But Jesus said to her: "Believe me, woman, the time is near at hand when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall men pray to the Father. You pray to one whom you know not, but we pray to the Father,

whom it is impossible not to know. For the time will come, and has indeed already come, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in works of love. And such worshippers, the Father requires. For God is a spirit, and we must serve him in spirit and in works of love." The woman did not altogether comprehend what he had said to her, but simply answered: "I have heard that God's messenger will come, even he who is named the Anointed, and he will tell us all things." And Jesus said to her: "I, who speak to thee, am he. Await nothing more."

After this Jesus came into the land of Judea and lived there with his disciples. At the same time John was washing the people in the river Aenon, near to Salim: for John had not yet been cast into prison. And there arose between the disciples of John and the disciples of Jesus a dispute as to which was better: the washing in water by John, or the teaching of Jesus. And they came to John and said to him: "Behold, thou wastest with water, but Jesus only teaches, and all men follow after him. What dost thou say of him?" And John answered and said: "No man can teach anything, unless he has been taught it by God. He who speaks of the earth, is earthly; but he who speaks of God, is of God. But we can give no proof whether the words he speaks be from God or not. For God is spirit, and a spirit cannot be proved or measured. Whoever receives the words of God thereby shows that he has comprehended God."

It happened that once on his way Jesus saw a man sitting, collecting taxes. And the name of the tax collector was Matthew. Jesus spoke to him, and

Matthew understood him, was attracted by his teaching, and invited him to his house. And he prepared him a feast.

When Jesus came to the house of Matthew, there came also some friends of Matthew, who were tax-collectors and people of loose lives. Jesus did not drive them away, but himself sat down, as well as his disciples. Now, when the lawyers and Pharisees saw this, they said to the disciples of Jesus: "How is it that your Teacher feasts with tax-collectors and people of loose lives?" Jesus heard them say this, and answered: "They who are in good health have no need of a physician, but only they who are ill. Wherefore I am not come to those who count themselves righteous, who think that they live in the truth, but I am come to those who think they are living in sin."

And when he was sitting in the house of a leper named Simon, a woman of the town came to him; and she was a prostitute. She knew that Jesus was there, and came thither, and brought with her a box of ointment. And she knelt down at his feet weeping, and with her tears she washed his feet, and with the hairs of her head she dried them, and she anointed them with the ointment. When Simon saw this, he thought within himself: "He can be no prophet; for if he were, he would know what kind of woman this is who is washing his feet, that she is a prostitute, and he would not let her touch him." Jesus guessed the thoughts of Simon, and, turning to him said: "I have something to say to thee, Simon." And he answered: "Say on." And Jesus said: "A man had two debtors; one owed him five hundred pence, and the other owed him fifty. But neither the one nor the

other was able to pay him. And he forgave them both. Now, which of the two, thinkest thou, will love him most, and be most attached to him ? " And Simon answered : " Of course, he who owed most." Then Jesus pointed to the woman, and said : " So is it with thee and with this woman. Thou countest thyself to be a small debtor, but she counts herself to be a large debtor. I came into thy house, and thou gavest me no water wherewith to wash my feet, but she has washed them with her tears, and has dried them with the hairs of her head. Thou didst not kiss me, but she kisses my feet ; thou gavest me no oil to anoint my head with, but she anoints my feet with costly ointment. He who thinks he has nothing to be pardoned, he does not love. But he who believes he is guilty in much, he loves much. And if a man only loves, all is forgiven him." And he said to her. " Thy sins are pardoned thee." Jesus also said : " All depend on this, what a man thinks of himself. He who thinks himself good, he will not be good ; and he who thinks himself bad, he is good."

Then he spake to them this parable : " Two men once went into the temple to pray. The one was a Pharisee, the other was not of the faithful, and a sinner. The Pharisee prayed in these words : ' I thank thee, Lord, that I am not as other men. I am no miser, do not cheat, am not dissolute, or a sinner like this tax-collector. I fast twice in the week, and give tithes of all I possess. Now, the unbeliever stood afar off, and did not dare raise his eyes to heaven, but smote himself on the breast, and said : ' Lord, look down on me, who am worth nothing ! ' And what happened ? More was forgiven to the unbeliever than to the Pharisee. For everyone who exalts

himself shall be abased, and they who abase themselves shall be exalted."

After this the disciples of John came to Jesus and said: "Why do we and they who observe the law fast much, whilst thou and thy disciples fast not?" And Jesus said to them: "No one mourns so long as the bridegroom is at the wedding-feast. Only when the bridegroom is no longer there do they mourn." Where there is life we must not mourn. And Jesus further spake thus: "No one tears a piece off a new garment to patch on to an old one; for the new cloth will rend it, and the old garment will not be repaired. For the same reason we cannot accept your fasts. Nor do men pour new wine into old leather bottles; for so the bottles will burst, and the wine will flow forth. But new wine must be placed into new leather bottles, and so both the wine and bottles will remain whole."

And the fame of Jesus spread, and he was glorified by all, so that the people kept him back, lest he should depart from among them. But he told them that he was come to announce happiness, not to one city, but to the whole world. And he went farther on through the towns on the seashore. And many of the people came to him from different cities. And he gave to them all his help. And he passed through the cities and villages; and everywhere he proclaimed the kingdom of God, and freed men from all their sufferings and vices. In this way was fulfilled in Jesus Christ the prophecy of Isaiah—

"A people living in darkness and in the shadow of death saw the light; and he who has received this light shall do no violence or hurt to men, but shall be gentle and humble; and that he may bring truth into the world

to men, he shall neither strive nor cry, and his voice shall not be heard aloud; for he shall neither break the bruised reed, nor quench the fire that is dim. And in him is the whole hope of man."

## CHAPTER III

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD

#### I. THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CONCERNING JOHN

Matt. xi. 2. Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>1</sup> πέμψα· δύο<sup>2</sup> τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, | John, having heard in the prison of the works of Christ, sent some of his disciples, and said to him.

3: Εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἔτι οὖν προσδεχόμεθα; | Art thou he that was to come, or shall we expect some other?

1. In many copies we find the word *Jesus*.

2. In many copies we have *διὰ* instead of *δύο*. *Διὰ* is the better reading, because the number of the disciples is quite unimportant.

The twenty-first verse in the seventh chapter of Luke is clearly an interpolation, intended to explain the words, "the blind see," etc. But these words are of themselves entirely intelligible.

In the wilderness John had preached the kingdom of God, and had declared that another, greater than he, would come after him, who would renew men in the



spirit. When, therefore, John heard of the works of Jesus, he sent to know whether he was this one, or whether another was to come. In other words, he wished to know whether Jesus had fulfilled his prophecy by proclaiming the establishment of the kingdom of God, and by renewing men in the spirit.

Matt. xi. 4: Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐταῖς· Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγέilate· Ἰωάννης, ὃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε.

And Jesus answered them and said: Go and tell John what you hear and see.

5: Τυφλοὶ ἀναβρίπτουσι, καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσι, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.<sup>1</sup>

Those who were in the dark see, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the unclean are become clean, the dead awake, and the poor have true happiness preached to them:

6: Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.<sup>2</sup>

And happy is the man who shall not cut himself off from me.

John asked: "Hast thou proclaimed the kingdom which the prophet Isaiah (xxxv. 5, lxi. 1) foretold, and of which I said that it was nigh at hand, and that purification in the spirit alone was necessary to enter it?" And Jesus answered and said: "Go and tell him what you see, even that men are now blessed in the spirit; for the prophecy is fulfilled, and all men are blessed in spirit. The poor have been made to know bliss."

1. Πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. In Luke and Matthew the verse ends with these words. They are always translated, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. This translation gives very nearly the exact

meaning, though in itself the translation is not quite correct.

In Luke xvi. 16 we read: *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται*. This is not to be translated, *the kingdom is preached*, but, *the kingdom is received*. In this, as well as in the passage before us, we should read, *the poor are revered*, that is, the poor receive tidings of happiness; and we must translate the words, *the poor are made to know their true happiness*.

These words express in another way the same idea as those words of Jesus: "Blessed are the poor." Both in Matthew and Luke they stand last, to show us that in them is the whole meaning of Christ's discourse. Nor should we forget that the remainder of the discourse is but a development and explanation of the fundamental idea of the real happiness of the poor, in opposition to the rich Pharisees and lawyers.

2. *Σκανδαλίζειν ἐν τινί* signifies, *to be offended in a person*, and, *to cut one's self off from a person* (Matt. xviii. 57, xvii. 27, xxvi. 31). In reply to John's question, "Art thou he who should come and open the kingdom of heaven to men?" he answers: "Go tell him what you see, how all are blessed that do not cut themselves off from me."

Math. xi. 7: Τούτων δὲ παρ-  
μένων, ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς  
λέγειν τοῖς  
ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου· τί ἐξήλθετε εἰς  
τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; καὶ αὐμοὶ ὑπο-  
κείμενοι σαλευόμενοι;

And when they had gone away, Jesus began to speak to the people concerning John: What went you out into the wilderness to see? How a reed is shaken in the wind?

8: Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν; ἂν-

Or again, what went you out

θρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἡμ-  
φισμένον; ἰδοὺ, οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ  
φοροῦντες, ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων  
εἰσίν.

to see? Did you go to look at a  
man in rich garments? Behold,  
they are before you: for they  
who wear rich robes and live in  
ease, live in palaces.

9: Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν;  
προφῆτην; ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ  
περισσότερον προφήτου.<sup>1</sup>

And so, what went you out to  
see? A prophet? Verily, I  
speak to you of that which is  
greater than a prophet.

10: Οὗτος γὰρ ἐστι περὶ οὗ  
γέγραπται Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω  
τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,  
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπρο-  
σθεν σου.

For this is he of whom it is  
written: Behold I send a mes-  
senger before thy face; he shall  
prepare the way before thee (Mal.  
iii. 1).

11: Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἐγ-  
ήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων  
Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ· ὁ δὲ μικρό-  
τερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν,  
μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.<sup>2</sup>

Verily I say unto you? No  
man has been born of woman  
greater than John the Baptist.  
He who is the very lowest here  
is the highest there, in the king-  
dom of God.

1. Λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου, *I speak  
to you of that which is of higher import than a  
prophet.*

2. The words, ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν  
οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, are generally translated, *he  
that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.*  
But this translation is incorrect, since the least in the  
kingdom of God is put in opposition to the greatest in  
any other kingdom. They should rather be translated,  
*The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than any in  
another kingdom.* But the chief reason for rejecting the  
ordinary translation is that it contradicts what goes

before and what immediately follows. We have just been told that John is the greatest of all men, and then suddenly we learn that he is less than the least in the kingdom of God. But Jesus only preaches the kingdom of heaven for all men. If we remember that in this place *αὐτοῦ* is an adverb, and signifies *there*, the whole passage becomes coherent and consistent.

In the opinion of the world, John is the lowest of men, poor and a beggar. But it is said that the lowest here is the highest in the kingdom of heaven; and this is repeated many times in the Gospels, as, for example, when we are told that the poor, and not the rich, are blessed. Moreover, the words *μικρός* and *μέγας*, as used in the Gospels, must not be translated *little* and *great*, for they signify, *nothing worth*, *low*, and *of consequence*, *high*.

Luke xvi. 16: Ο νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τ. π. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται. The law and the prophets were until John. But from his time is announced the bliss of the Kingdom of God, and every man enters it by his own will.

1. It is said in Matt. xi. 12: "From the days of John the Baptist till now the kingdom of heaven is besieged, and the violent take it." In Luke we read: καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται; that is, "by force, as in a crowd, they thrust themselves in." I have chosen Luke's version as being the most detailed, and translate the word *βιάζεται*, *enter by their own will*.

Matt. xi. 13: Πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προφήτευσαν. For all the prophets and the law until John declared the will of God.

14 : Καὶ εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι, αὐτός | If you will, receive him, for  
 ἔστιν Ἡλίας, ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. | Elias, who was to come.

1. Προφητεῦειν signifies, *to have the gift of prophecy, to declare the will of God.*

It is said that the law and all the prophets up to the time of John declared the will of God. All this came to an end with the appearance of John. From his time the kingdom of God is taken by the power of the soul, and therefore all that had been said of the coming of Elias must be abandoned. "If you believe that Elias should come before the advent of God's kingdom, you may think that John has come in place of Elias."

Matt. xi. 15 : Ὁ ἔχων ἑτα | He that wishes to understand,  
 ἀκούειν, ἀκούειτο. | will understand.

This sentence occurs in Matthew three times, and each time when the words preceding can have a double meaning. It is therefore designed to be a warning that we do not take the words in their rude literal sense but that we are to understand them figuratively.

Luke vii. 29 : Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός | And all the common people  
 ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι, ἐδικαίωσαν | heard him, and the tax-collectors  
 τὸν θεόν, βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα | justified God by purifying them-  
 Ἰωάννου. | selves with the purification of  
 John.

30 : Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νο- | But the Pharisees and lawyers  
 μικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἤθετη- | rejected the counsel of God, and  
 σαν εἰς ἑαυτούς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες | were not washed by John.  
 ἐν αὐτοῦ.

31: Ἐἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος. Τίτι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης; <sup>1</sup> καὶ τίτι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι;

And Jesus said: To whom shall we liken people of this nature?

32: "Ὅμοιοί εἰσι παῖδις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις, καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ λεγουσιν· Ἠυλόησαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὥρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε.

They are like little children. The children sit in the streets and chatter one with another. They say: We play, but you do not dance; we wail before you, but you do not weep.

33: Ἐβήλουν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστῆς μήτε ἕστον ἐσθίειν, μήτε οἶνον πίνειν καὶ λέγετε· Δαιμόνιον ἔχει.

John came, neither eating nor drinking, and they said: He is possessed.

34: Ἐβήλουν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν καὶ λέγετε· Ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἶνον πότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν.

The son of man came eating and drinking, and they said: He is a glutton and a drunkard, the friend of tax-collectors and the dissolute.

35: Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς· πάντων.<sup>2</sup>

And Wisdom has been justified by her works.

1. The words, *people of this nature*, clearly refer to the Pharisees.

2. In many copies we have *ἔργων*. The meaning will be the same, but clearer, and this is why I adopt this reading. The somewhat obscure reference to the children also becomes plainer if we apply it to the lawyers and Pharisees; that is, to the rich and powerful, in opposition to the common people and the despised tax-collectors. The idea is that, in order to know God, the Pharisees took their doctrines one from the other.

John v. 43: "I am come in the name of my Father,

and you receive me not; but if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive."

44: "How can you believe when you receive honour of one another, but do not seek the honour which is from God only?"

They are like children chattering in the street, and, forsooth, are surprised that they are not listened to, and are astonished that they do not understand. But how can they understand when they listen only to their own teaching? They wish to make merry; but John demands of them repentance and the renunciation of wealth. They wish to fast, to observe sabbaths, to have no intercourse with sinners; but Jesus does not ordain that men should fast, or observe sabbaths, or reject sinners.

## II. CONVICTION OF THE CITIES

Matt. xi. 20: Τότε ἤρξατο ἐνειδίζειν τὰς πόλεις, ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐ μετενόησαν.

21: Οὐαὶ σοι, Χοραζὶν, οὐαὶ σοι, Βηθσαιδάν· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις ἢ αἱ γινόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ ὀποδῶ μετενόησαν.

22: Πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀναικτίτερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ ὑμῖν.

After this, he began to upbraid the cities in which his powers had been most manifested, because they had not repented.

Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the powers manifested in you had been manifested in Tyre and Sidon, they had long ago repented in sackcloth and ashes.

But I say unto you: In the day of judgment, it shall be more joyous for Tyre and Sidon than for you.

23 : Καὶ τὸ, Καπερναούμ, ἢ εἰς  
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα, ἔως ἄδου  
καταβιβασθήσῃ· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις  
ἐγένοντο αἱ ἰσχυραὶ αἱ γινόμεναι ἐν  
σοί, ἔμειναν ἕως μέχθρος τῆς σήμερον.

And thou, Capernaum, which  
art exalted unto heaven, shalt be  
cast down to hell; for if the  
powers manifested in you had  
been manifested in Sodom, it had  
remained till this day.

24 : Πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐν  
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως ἔσται ἡ πόλις  
αὕτη ἥσσον ἢ σοί.

But I say unto you: In the  
day of judgment, it shall be more  
joyous for Sodom than for you.

These words are ordinarily translated in such a way that they are not only unintelligible, but actually have no meaning at all. Why does Christ reproach the cities? If they did not believe in his miracles, it follows that they had been performed to no purpose, or that he had performed them too sparingly or too badly. But if it is for their disbelief in his miracles that he upbraids them, what are we to understand when told that, if the wonders done in Cherazin and Bethsaida had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented in sackcloth and ashes; and that, if the miracles performed in Capernaum had been performed in Sodom, it would have remained standing till this day?

Moreover, the ordinary translation does not harmonise with what goes before or with what follows. Suddenly, whilst explaining the import of John's mission and speaking of the kingdom of God, Christ begins upbraiding these cities. Such is the meaning, or rather absence of all meaning, generally given to these verses. The translation is purely arbitrary, and leaves the passage quite meaningless.

1. *Δυνάμεις* is often translated *mighty works*, a signification the word never had.



2. *Ἐμειναν* is made to relate to Sodom, though it is in the plural and in close connection with *δυνάμεις*. Similarly, in the twentieth verse, *μετενόησαν* relates to some indefinite subject, whilst it stands in connection with *δυνάμεις*. I have tried to give a different translation of the whole passage, but confess that it does not get rid of all the difficulties. The passage, which is obscure and cannot be brought into accord with what precedes or follows, still remains unintelligible.

### III. COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Luke xvii. 20: Ἐπερωτηθεῖς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων, πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως·

21: Οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· Ἰδοὺ ὦδε, ἢ, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

23: Καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· Ἰδοὺ ὦδε. ἢ, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· μὴ ἀπέλθητε, μὴ δὲ διώξετε.

24: "Ὅσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή, ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανό, εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει· οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ.

And the Pharisees asked Jesus: How and when will the kingdom of God come? And he answered them: The kingdom of God comes not in such a way that it can be seen;

Nor can we say of it: Behold, it is here, or, behold, it is there; for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.

And if men say unto you: Behold, it is here, or, behold, it is there; do not follow or run after them.

For, like the lightning, it shall shine forth from the heaven in a moment, and such shall be the son of man in his time.

## IV. DISCOURSE WITH NICODEMUS

John iii. 1: Ἦν δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδεμος ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ἀρχὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews.

2: Οὗτος ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν νυκτός, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, οἶδ' αὖτεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδὲ γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα δύναται ποιεῖν ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ. He came to Jesus by night, and said to him: We know, Sir, that thou art come from God to teach us; for no one could give such proofs, if God were not with him.

1. *Σημεῖον*, a sign, or proof-mark, by which a thing or person is known.

2. *Ποιεῖν*, besides its signification, *to do*, or *to make*, constantly takes the meaning of the substantive in action, with which it is connected. Thus, for example, *πρόθεσιν ποιεῖν* (Eph. iii. 11), *to purpose*; *ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος* (Luke x. 37), *he that showed mercy*. We must therefore translate *σημεῖα ποιεῖν*, *to give proofs*.

John iii. 3: Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. And Jesus answered and said to him: Truly, I tell thee, he who is not conceived of God from heaven, he only cannot understand what the kingdom of God is.

1. *Γεννᾶσθαι*, *to be conceived*, *to be born of a father*. The words *γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*, therefore, signify, *be conceived of God the Father*.

2. *Ἄνωθεν*, *from on high*, *from heaven*, *from him*.

*who is in heaven, from God.* Inasmuch as this expression is subsequently replaced by the words *from God*, I have, to avoid all obscurity, translated it, *from heaven*; that is, from the infinite.

In reply to the words of Nicodemus, "We know that thou art from God," Jesus answers by speaking of the kingdom of God. The want of connection between the answer made by Jesus and the words spoken by Nicodemus is patent to all. But it seems to me, that if we understand the whole discourse with Nicodemus, as it is generally understood, there is not only no connection between the words of Nicodemus and those of Jesus, but the words of Nicodemus tell us nothing, have literally no meaning, and evoke no answer. Interpreted in this way, they are altogether superfluous, and might better have been altogether omitted.

The words of Nicodemus obtain a meaning only when we complete his words by supposing him to have said: "How is it that thou sayest that services and sacrifices to God are unnecessary, and that we have no need of a temple, and yet thou speakest of a kingdom of God?"

Nicodemus recognised the truthfulness and high import of Christ's teaching; but he knew, from what Jesus had before said, that he rejected services and sacrifices to God, and he was unable to understand how there could be a kingdom of God without the God of the Jews, whom they worshipped in the temple. This he could not understand, and, therefore, came by night alone secretly to Jesus, and asked him: "How is it thou teachest us of a kingdom of God, and yet destroyest all communion with God?" This doubt is the natural outcome of what goes before, the destruction of the temple, and of what follows the

answer of Jesus, who proceeds to explain what his God is, and what he understands by the kingdom of God.

It is evident that these words, serving to connect the speech of Nicodemus with that of Jesus, once formed a part of the text. They were probably omitted or altered by the copyists, who were believers in the God of the Jews. But even without these words it is not difficult to find the connection of the whole narrative, if we understand the true meaning of what goes before.

The teaching of Christ is comprised in the proclamation of the kingdom of God and, at the same time, in the rejection of the observance of the law and of all service rendered to an external God.

This is the idea expressed by Nicodemus: "Thou preachest the kingdom of God, but rejectest the God of the Jews. What, then, is thy kingdom, and what, then, is thy God?" And at once, in his very first words, Jesus told Nicodemus how the kingdom of God always exists, how it is within us, how it is impossible not to recognise the kingdom of God, and that, if a man does not recognise it, it is only because he has not been conceived of God. The conditional form of the third and fifth verses does not imply, as the Church understands, and thereby destroys their sense, that we ought to be conceived of God, or that man should strive to be conceived from on high and of the spirit; but the words mean that every man, inasmuch as he is man, is necessarily conceived from on high and of the spirit.

John iii. 4 : λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ  
Νικodemus· Ὡς δύναται ἄνθρωπος  
γεννηθῆναι, γένων ὢν, μὴ δύναται  
εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ  
δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ γεννηθῆναι;

And Nicodemus said : How can  
a man be conceived, when he is  
already old : He cannot enter  
a second time into the womb of  
his mother, and be conceived.

1. Our translation of *γεννᾶσθαι* is confirmed by these words of Nicodemus. Nicodemus says: "A man has already been conceived, before he is born in the flesh of his father: how, then, can he be conceived a second time?"

We must be destroyed, and conceived again of God from the womb of the mother.

Nicodemus in his ignorance repeats word for word exactly what the Church teaches concerning the conception of Jesus in the womb of Mary by the Holy Spirit, as if it had been by a father in the flesh.

John iii. 5: Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὲν ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος<sup>1</sup> καὶ Πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. And Jesus answered him: Truly, I say unto you: Only he, who is not conceived of the flesh and also of the spirit, cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

1. The word *ὕδωρ* signifies, not only *water*, but also, *the watery fluid of the human body*. So, in John xix. 34, we read: "There came out blood and water" (*sanies*).

John iii. 6: Τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, σὰρξ ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, πνεῦμά ἐστι.

For that which is conceived of the body is body, and that which is conceived of the spirit is spirit.

8: Τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου<sup>1</sup> θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶ πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος.<sup>2</sup>

The spirit blows, where and when it will, and the sound of it is understood; but none knows whence it comes, and whither it goes. So is it with everyone who is conceived of the spirit.

1. Ὅπου signifies indifferently, *where* or *when*.

2. I have placed the eighth verse before the seventh, because it is more consonant with our ordinary mode of thought and speech to express first our idea, and then to add, "do not marvel," than, as in the text before us, first to say, "marvel not that I tell you," and then proceed to expound our idea.

John iii 7. *Μὴ θαυμάσις ὅτι·* And, therefore, marvel not that  
*εἶπόν σοι·* Διὶ ὅρα· γεννηθῆναι· I have said unto you: We must  
*ᾠσώμεν.* be conceived of God.

This verse has a deep and serious significance. Indeed, every word in this verse is of the profoundest and gravest import. Nor is its meaning in anyway sacramental and mystical, but it is perfectly clear, however profound.

It has already been said, in the third verse, that a man must be conceived from on high, that is, of God. But when Nicodemus understood him to speak of a fleshly conception, Jesus told him that, besides the fleshly conception, there is another, not of the flesh. And to express this idea, that it is not of the flesh, he employed the word spirit.

And now he explains what this flesh of the flesh and spirit of the spirit in man is, and in the eighth verse the source of the life of the spirit is defined, and Jesus says: "The spirit," that is, what is not flesh, "blows," that is, moves and lives, "where it wills," that is freely, independently of everything, of itself and in itself, "and the sound of it is understood," that is, it speaks intelligently, "but none knows whence it comes and whither it goes," that is, it is above the control of the law of cause and effect.

We must, then, understand this to mean: "The spiritual source of life is free, intelligent, and beyond

the control of the law of cause and effect." Let us only say this in such a way that all may understand it, and it will be impossible for us to say it otherwise than it is here said.

John iii. 9: Ἀπεκρίθη Νικοδήμους καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γινέσθαι;

And Nicodemus answered and said: How is it possible that it should be so?

10: Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;<sup>1</sup>

And in reply Jesus said to him: Thou art a teacher, and therefore dost not understand this.

1. There is no occasion for a note of interrogation in this place. Jesus says: "Thou, as a teacher in Israel, it is to be understood, canst not understand this."

John iii. 11: Ἀμὲν ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ὃ οἶδαμεν καὶ λέγομεν, καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε.

Truly, I say unto you: We speak of that which we know, and we show that which we have seen; but you accept not the proofs of our testimony.

12: Εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· πῶς, εἰάν εἶπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια,<sup>1</sup> πιστεύσετε;

I have spoken to you of that which is on the earth, and you believe not; how shall you believe, if I begin to speak of that which is in heaven?

1. Τὰ ἐπίγεια and τὰ ἐπουράνια are often falsely translated *earthly* and *heavenly*; but they properly signify *that which is on the earth*, and *that which is in heaven*.

John iii. 13: Καὶ οὐδεὶς<sup>1</sup> ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·<sup>2</sup> ὃς ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ·<sup>3</sup>

No one has ascended to heaven, save the son of man who came down from heaven, and who is in heaven.

1. In some copies we have οὐδεὶς δὴ.

2. Here for the first time in the Gospels we meet with the expression *son of man*. In the passage referring to the sabbath, the same expression is used in the simple sense of *man*. And in the verse, "angels shall ascend and descend," it may also be understood to mean *man* in the peculiar sense which Jesus gives to that word. But here the meaning of the word in this peculiar sense is precisely defined.

It has already been said that there is in man this spirit conceived from heaven of God and now we are told that no one has been in heaven with God, that no one has ascended to God, and therefore we can say nothing definitely of God; but that the son of the spirit was conceived of God and descended from heaven, — the spirit of man, the same that remains always in heaven with God. And therefore the son of man signifies *spirit*, the son of the spirit is *man*.

For those who know the Gospels it will be superfluous to cite the passages in which we find the expression *son of man* and *son of God* applied to men. In all these places it has one and the same meaning. Thus: "The son of man on whom God the Father has set his seal" (John vi. 27). "That thou mayst be the son of the Father" (Matt. v. 45). "And you shall be the sons of the Highest" (Luke vi. 35).

3. Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, literally signifies, *he who is in heaven*. To be in heaven signifies to be God. The words *heavenly* and *divine* are equivalent terms. And therefore *he who is in heaven* signifies *he who is God*.



John iii. 14: Καὶ καθὼς Μωσὴς ὕψωσε<sup>1</sup> τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρημῳ, οὕτως ἐψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. And as Moses set up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the son of man be set up.

1. 'Ὑψόειν signifies, *to exalt, to set up, to raise in rank, to be puffed up with pride* (Luke i. 52; Acts xiii. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 7). As is clear from the context in this passage, relating to the serpent, before which Moses bade the people prostrate themselves, and by doing which they were saved, we must understand by the word ὕψωσε, the dedication of the serpent in the wilderness. To understand fully the meaning of the words, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness," we must remember what is said of this incident in the Book of Numbers (xvi. 5-9)-

"And the people spake against the Lord and against Moses. 'Wherefore have you brought us up out of Egypt to destroy us in this wilderness, where there is neither bread nor water, and where we are sick of this poor food?' Then the Everlasting sent poisonous serpents among them, and they bit the people, so that a large number of the people of Israel died. Then the people came to Moses and said: 'We have done wrongly in that we spake against thee and against the Lord; pray the Lord that he drive these serpents away from among us.' And Moses interceded for the people, and the Everlasting said to him: 'Make a serpent, and set it upon a pole, and everyone that is bitten, let him look upon it, and he shall be saved.' And Moses made a brazen serpent, and set it upon a pole; and they who had been bitten by a serpent, when they looked upon the serpent of brass, behold, they lived."

Such is the narrative as given in Numbers. To set up the son of man as Moses set up the serpent, signifies

to regard the son of man even as the Jews regarded the serpent in the wilderness; that is to say, men must depend on him, and seek in him their salvation.

In the Wisdom of Solomon (xvi. 5-7) we also read—

"And when they perished from the bite of serpents, thy anger lasted not long, and they suffered but for a while, that they might learn; and to them was given the pattern of salvation, that they might not forget thy commandments. And he who turned to the image was saved, not because he looked upon it, but because thou savest all men."

And, therefore, to set up the son of God in man, as Moses set up the serpent, signifies, to give the mode, or means, of salvation.

John iii. 15: "ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἀπολέται." So that everyone that believes in him may not perish, but have life without end.

1. Ἀπολλύναι signifies, to kill, to destroy, to perish. As it is here used in opposition to everlasting life, it evidently means, to perish, to be destroyed, to die.

2. Αἰώνιον signifies, not subject to the conditions of time.

John iii. 16: Οὕτω γὰρ ἡγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογεγνητὸν ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, μὴ ἀπολέται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. For God so loved mankind, and even gave his own son, that every man who commits himself to him should not perish, but have life without end.

1. Οὕτω does not refer to ὥστε, firstly, because such a correlation of these two particles is not found in all

the Gospels, and is contrary to the style and language of the evangelists; and, secondly, because such a correlation gives an entirely false and unnatural meaning to the whole passage.

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only son," as the Church interprets this place, conveys an idea that cannot be applied to God. We may say of a man, he loved him so much that he gave him his last shilling; but in reference to the infinite source of life, in reference to God, we cannot speak of a sacrifice made by God.

*Οὕτω γάρ* serves to connect what has gone before with what follows. It has been said that, as Moses set up the serpent, so must the son of man be set up, that men may not die, but have life.

And now it is said that, as Moses, loving the people, made a serpent, that they might be saved, so God gave his son to the world, that men might be saved. This verse and the following one answer the thought that must have occurred to Nicodemus, and that occurs to us all, when we think of the meaning of life. "Why should anyone have created me, merely that I should die?" It is to this question that Jesus gives an answer. He had already told us that man need not perish, need not be destroyed; and now he confirms this, and says: "God cannot have given his son"—that is life—"to men, in order that they should die; but he loved mankind, and for their true happiness gave them life, not that this life should perish, but that it should be everlasting." We must also remember that in this place we cannot understand by the word God, either our God or the God of the Jews, or any determined being.

We have been told before that no one has known or can know God, that no one has ascended to heaven, and

that only he who came from heaven is in heaven, and that man is born from the spirit; and therefore here, under the word God, is to be understood the source, the beginning of spiritual life in man.

Of this source it is said only that it "loved the world"; that is, all we know of it is that subjectively it is "love," and objectively it is "true happiness."

John iii. 17: Οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν<sup>1</sup> ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον,<sup>2</sup> ἵνα κρίνῃ<sup>3</sup> τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ. For God sent his son into the world, not to punish the world with death, but that the world should have life in him.

1. *To come into the world* is a Hebrew expression, and signifies *to be born*; and *sent into the world* ought therefore to be understood to mean, *was born into the world*.

2. *Κόσμος* signifies *the world*, and in a general sense *mankind*.

3. *Κρίνειν* signifies *to separate, to weed, to pick out, to distinguish, to judge*; but in the Gospels, Epistles, and Acts of the Apostles, and particularly in John, it generally has the cognate meaning of, *to punish with death*. Thus: "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment" (John vii. 24). "Moreover, I seek not mine own glory; there is one who seeks and judges" (John viii. 50). "Pilate said to them: 'Take him, and judge him according to your law.' The Jews said to him: 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death'" (John xviii. 31). "Then Paul said to him: 'God shall smite thee, thou whited wall; thou sittest, to judge according to the law, and thou

commanded me to be whipped, which is contrary to the law' (Acts xiii 3) 'Who has even dared to profane the temple we have therefore taken him and would have him judged according to our law (Acts xxiv 6) Many other passages might be quoted. In these historical passages, *κρίνειν* plainly has this meaning. But in didactic passages wherever the words *κρίνειν* and *κρίσις* occur they invariably correspond in sense with our words *punishment by death* and *to punish with death*. In the following four passages for example they are used in direct opposition to *life* and therefore must express a state of death. Verily verily I say unto you He who hears my word and believes on him who sent me has everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation but has passed from death to life' (John v 24). And if anyone shall hear my words and not believe I do not condemn him, for I came not to condemn the world, but to save the world (John xii 47) "Now is the condemnation of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John xii 31) "For God has sent his own son into the world, not to condemn the world but that the world might be saved through him" (John iii 17).

God sent, gave a son to the world, begat a son for the world. No one has ascended to heaven, save the son of man who came from heaven. Every man is born from God. And it therefore follows that this spirit which is in man, and which is born from God, this son of man who came from heaven, this son of God who was given to the world, and this light which shone into the world, are all one and the same.

The light is that which in the introduction was called intelligence, *λόγος*. And all that follows will be found

to support the view that the light signifies the same as the son of God and the son of man.

From all this we see that these different terms—(1) God; (2) spirit; (3) son of God; (4) son of man; (5) light; And (6) intelligence, have one and the same meaning; the one or other of these terms being always used which best and most closely corresponds with the subject of discourse.

Thus when it is said to be the beginning and origin of all things, it is called "God"; when it is spoken of as the opposite to the flesh, it is called "spirit"; when it is spoken of in reference to its origin, it is called the "son of God"; when its manifestations are spoken of, it is called the "son of man"; and when it is spoken of in its relation to the reason, it is called "light" and "intelligence."

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>John iii. 18: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων, ἤδη κρίνεται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦ, <sup>1</sup> υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.</p> | <p>He who believes in the son, is not punished with death; he who believes not, is already punished, in that he does not believe in that which is the son, one and the same by nature as God.</p> |
|--|---|

1. *Μονογενής* signifies, of the same race, one and the same in nature (see p. 24).

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>John iii. 19: Αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἡγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ πενηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα.</p> | <p>And this is the punishment by death, that light has come into the world but men have preferred darkness to light, because their deeds were ill.</p> |
|---|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>20: Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα <sup>1</sup> πράσσει, καὶ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, <sup>2</sup> ἵνα <sup>3</sup> μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ <sup>3</sup> τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.</p> | <p>For everyone that does ill avoids the light, so that his deeds may not be made manifest.</p> |
|---|---|

1. Φαῦλος signifies *bad, worthless, empty*.

2. *ἵνα* has in the Gospels, and particularly in John, the same meaning as ὥστε, *so that*, and this is its meaning here. Compare John ix. 2, 39, xii. 38, 40, xviii. 9, 32, xix. 24; Apocalypse xiii. 13.

3. In many copies we have φανερωθῇ.

4. These concluding words are wanting in most manuscripts.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| John iii. 21: 'Ο δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστὶν ἐργασμῖνα. | But he who lives in the truth comes to the light, so that his deeds are made manifest. |
|--|--|

This discourse with Nicodemus is a full exposition of all the fundamental principles of Christ's teaching concerning the kingdom of God in the world. It is the explanation of what man is, of what God is, of what life is, and what the kingdom of God is. On the one hand, it is a development of the principal ideas expressed during the temptation in the wilderness; and, on the other hand, it is an exposition, on the authority of Jesus Christ himself, of those same principles that are laid down, on the authority of the evangelist, in the introductory verses of his Gospel.

In subsequent chapters of the Gospel of John, with the exception of the farewell discourse, in which truths not touched upon here are set forth, we find these fundamental principles further explained from various fresh points of view.

The fifth chapter, in which we have the story of the healing of the woman on the sabbath day, and the sixth, where the bread from heaven is spoken of, and where we have the discourse in the temple, and the words that were called forth from Christ by the cure of the man who had been blind from his birth, explain, throw light upon, and confirm much that goes before; but, spoken as they were fragmentarily, as occasion inspired them, these discourses repeat what has been said before, sometimes not fully, sometimes not clearly, as it seems, till we recall the teaching conveyed in the conversation with Nicodemus, which is the interpretation of the ideas expressed during the temptation, and the repetition of the ideas enunciated in the introduction to the Gospel.

In order to have a full understanding of all these later discourses, it is absolutely necessary that we first have a clear conception of these ideas.

#### V. MEANING OF THE DISCOURSE WITH NICODEMUS

1. In vers. 1 to 5 we are told that, besides the source of life recognised by men in the conception of a child in the womb of its mother from a father in the flesh, there is another source of the life of man which is not of the flesh.

This source of a life that is not of the flesh Jesus names the "Father," or "spirit." He had already taught this in the temple, whilst yet a child, when he called God his "Father." And the same idea is expressed in the words of the tempter in the wilderness: "If thou be the son of God"; as well as in the answer made by Christ: "Man lives not by bread, but by all that proceeds from



the mouth of God, by spirit." And once more it occurs in the introduction to this Gospel: "The beginning of all things was made the intelligence of life; and all was begotten through it; and without it was nothing begotten."

2. The sixth, seventh, and eighth verses declare that this source of life that is not of the flesh is intelligent and free; that every man knows he has it within him, and understands its voice; but he does not know its source. So in the fourth and fifth verses of the introduction we read: "In it was the power of life, and the light became the life of men. And the light shines in the darkness; and the darkness does not extinguish it."

3. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth verses it is said that we cannot reach or comprehend that which is in heaven, this infinite source of life that is not of the flesh; but that we know this source, because in us, in every man, is found the spirit, which proceeds from the infinite and itself is infinite; that this spirit is in man, and is that which we must hold to be the source of all sources. The same thing is said in the introduction: "No one has conceived God, and no one ever will conceive him; the son, who is of the same nature, and is in the bosom of the Father, has shown the way" (John i. 18). "The beginning of all things was made the intelligence of life; and it became the beginning of all things in place of God" (John i. 1, 2).

4. In the fourteenth verse it is said that this spirit in man, which proceeds from the infinite, and is related to it as son to the father of this infinite source in man,

is that which we should make our God, and thus replace a fancied god by the true and only God. The same was said by John the Baptist of the kingdom of God: "When the spirit shall purify men"; and it was also said to Nathanael: "Heaven shall be opened, and the powers of God shall descend on the son of man"; and lastly, it was said to the woman at Samaria: "God is a spirit, and we must worship him in spirit and in works of love."

5. In the fifteenth verse it is asserted that faith in this one true God rescues from destruction and gives life without end. The same thing is asserted in the introduction to this Gospel: "It appeared in the world, and the world was begotten through it, but the world did not acknowledge it" (John i. 10). "It appeared in separate individuals, and they did not receive it into themselves" (John i. 11). "But all they who comprehended it, to them all it gave the possibility of becoming sons of God, through belief in his being" (John i. 12). "This has been written, that you may believe Jesus to be the Christ, the son of God, and, believing, may have life in his name" (John xx. 31). In the fifteenth verse of the discourse with Nicodemus, it is said that faith in the son of man gives imperishable life. In the introduction we are told this faith makes men sons of God. To believe in the son and to have life without end, is one and the same thing. This is also what we read in the story of the Temptation, where it is said that, after the last temptation, Jesus was conscious of the power of the spirit.

6. In the sixteenth and seventeenth verses Jesus

declares that if we possess life, the highest happiness possible to us, it follows that the giver of this highest happiness desires that we should be happy, and must love us, and therefore, though we cannot know the infinite source in itself, we none the less know that it is benevolent and loves us, and its relationship to us is love, and our life is happiness.

If God, loving us, gave us life as our true happiness he will not punish us with death, and will not destroy us, but he will give us life without end, free from all that is evil, even as it is said in the Epistle of John. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" And this life we have, and we commit our life to this spirit, to the light, to God who is the source of our life. In the Parable of the Vineyard and in the farewell discourse this idea, that love is the source of our life, is minutely and clearly set forth.

7 In the eighteenth verse it is said that life without end in the spirit has been given us and that only when we forsake the source of life do we for a time destroy it; but so long as we do not stray from it, we have life without end. The same idea is expressed in that part of the story of the Temptation where we read that, after Jesus had resolved to work alone for God, 'the power of God came upon him and served him'

8 From the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first verses we learn that what we count to be "punishment by death," "destruction," "death," is not caused by any will external to ourselves, by God, as we generally imagine, but this destruction is the consequence of our own will.

In order to understand this, we must take care to

remember that Jesus never once spoke of a life beyond the grave, but emphatically denied any such life, as when he said: "Let the dead bury the dead: God is God of the living, not of the dead." All that he has told us is, that life has one source in time, the flesh, and one source out of time, the spirit, the son of God.

If we put all our trust in our temporary life, and believe in it, we are destroyed and die; but if we put all our trust in the spirit, in the source of life, and believe in it, in the son of God, we have life without end, life indestructible.

The manifestation of a life of intelligence in the world resembles the appearance of light in the midst of darkness. And the relation of man to life is also the same as his relation to light. As it is in the power of each man to go to the light, or to keep away from it, so is it in the power of each man to go to intelligence and to life, or to keep from it. The ruin and destruction of men is nothing more than the wilful departure from intelligence and life; just as darkness is but the consequence of the voluntary departure of men from light.

Punishment by death consists in this, that they who do ill thereby separate themselves from intelligence and from life. And this comparison is made still closer by the fact that, as men who do ill do not like the light, and do not seek it, since they are unwilling it should be seen that their deeds are evil, so men who do ill do not like intelligence, and do not court it, lest it should be made patent that their deeds are evil.

To be in the light signifies, to live in intelligence, not for time; to be in darkness signifies, to live without intelligence, to perish. This is also taught us in the fifth

and tenth verses of the introduction: "In it was the power of life; and the light became the life of men. And the light shines in darkness; and the darkness does not extinguish it. It was the true light that lights every man who comes into the world. It was in the world, but the world did not acknowledge it." The same thing is said in the story of the Temptation, when Jesus declared that he works only for God, and thus obtained his complete victory over the tempter.

9. All that goes before is designed to define for us what Jesus understands by the phrase, "the kingdom of God": the kingdom which John preached, and which he himself preaches.

The discourse began with Jesus saying that 'every man through his conception from God is already in the kingdom of God, and the whole discourse is an exposition of what we are to understand by "the kingdom of God," and how we may enter it.

To set up the son of God in man, to depend on him, to live in the truth; this is to be in the kingdom of God: to do the opposite to this, is to be destroyed, or, not to be in the kingdom of God. The discourse with Nicodemus concludes with these words: "God has sent into the world his son, who is such as he himself is,—the life of intelligence,—and thereby he has enabled every man to escape destruction, to live without end, and to be a son of the kingdom of God."

The purpose and aim of God is, not the death of men, but life. Not for death, but for life, has he given men life—the light of intelligence. He who believes in the spirit, in the son, lives "in the light of intelligence, and shall not die, but has his place in the kingdom of God."

but he who does not believe in the light of the spirit, the son, has no life, but shall die and perish. Only in this does death really consist, namely, that the light of life was given to men, but they do ill, and thereby deprive themselves of light. Everyone who does ill strays from the light of intelligence and perishes; but he who lives in the truth, and remains in the light of intelligence, has life in the kingdom of God.

The idea conveyed in these verses may also be applied to explain the Parable of the Sower. The light of intelligence is given to men even as the seed is given to the earth by the sower. Some of the seeds fall on the stony ground, some among thorns, and some on good soil. It is in this sense all understand the parable, and so I understand it.

The difference between my interpretation and that adopted by the Church consists in this: I understand the word God as Jesus defined it in his reply to the tempter, and as he employed it in his discourse with Nicodemus and in his conversation with the woman of Samaria. I do not identify him with the God-Creator of the Jews, whom Jesus denied, but whom the Church acknowledges.

If God be the omnipotent Creator, all-merciful and all-knowing, as the Church teaches, the question naturally suggests itself, "Why did this all-merciful and omnipotent being create man in such a way that he could become evil and perish? Why is there such a thing as death?"

The all-powerful, all-knowing God need not have created evil, and could extinguish evil; but he has allowed it to continue and to multiply. Why does he let people perish, when he could save them from sin and

death? Why did he create the devil, and then allow him to fall?

They who acknowledge and confess this God, the creator of all things, are obliged, in order to explain away this glaring contradiction, to invent the devil, the story of the fall of Adam, the doctrine of a ransom, and the necessity of a sacrifice.

This misapprehension of Christ's teaching, his denial of the Jewish God-Creator, and the replacement of this God by the one true God Spirit, the Father of the son of man, the spirit of intelligence, has unavoidably led to the invention of a number of senseless, immoral seductive dogmas such as the creation of evil spirits by God, the necessity of a ransom, or eternal punishments. It only requires that we should well understand what has been said in the earlier chapters, and what indeed is said in all the Gospels, of the son of man, who is of the same nature as the Father, and whom Jesus confessed, and we at once become disembarassed of all the contradictions. The Parable of the Sower, and other parables, propose, as it were, this very question, "What is that which men call evil?" and give the true answer to it.

Jesus preached that no one knows or ever has known, any God-Creator, lawgiver, and judge; and that there only is in man the spirit that descends from the infinite source, the son of the spirit, the light of intelligence, and that in this spirit is life.

It is said in the discourse with Nicodemus that the source of life, God, loved the world, and gave life to the world. But it is not said that God loved each individual man, and not only is this nowhere said, but we are distinctly told that God loved the world, that is, mankind as a whole, and wished to give man life. He therefore

gave his son to the world, and thereby gave to the world, that is, mankind, life, and the power to enter into the kingdom of God. And with this declaration is intimately connected the Parable of the Sower.

#### VI. PARABLE OF THE SOWER AND THE SEED

In the first of the parables, that of the Sower, we find the fullest representation of what that God is who gave life to the world, and why and how he gave the world life. But a complete and full representation of God, the beginning of all things, can be given only in the way of a parable.

Now, this is the comparison made in the parable. The sower, who is fond of his wheat, and anxious about its growth, represents God, who loves the world and cares for its welfare; but as the sower does not occupy himself with each separate seed, so God does not anxiously occupy himself with each separate individual. Like the sower, he busies himself with the harvest, and knowing that, though many of the seeds will be lost, there will still be a harvest, sows liberally. So God plants his seed in all men, knowing that, though many will perish, there will still be a harvest.

And further than this God does not interfere in the affairs of the world, as we are pointedly told in the Parable of the Leaven (Matt. xiii. 33), p. 210.

If we comprehend God as Jesus defines him, the accusation against God, that he has created evil and death, and therefore loves evil and death, falls to the ground. In general, this difficulty, which is a personal question, is wrongly raised in reference to a universal



phenomenon. When an individual petulantly charges God with having permitted death, it is the same as if any single seed were to accuse the sower of desiring its death, because it has fallen into a stream and perished, whilst the other seeds take root, grow up, and flourish. He who created these millions of seeds did not create them that they should perish; but, on the contrary, that they should not perish. The aim of his creation is life, and not death.

From a general point of view, from God's point of view, this is reasonable.

But if a man asks why he has death in him, the answer will be a subjective answer, and the same as is given in the parable and in all the didactic portions of the Gospels. It is because he wills it. Every seed has the possibility to grow and bear fruit, and every man has the possibility to become a son of God, and not to know death.

Jesus, when he says, as we read in Luke: "Take heed how you understand," warningly directs attention to the danger of an incomplete and faulty comprehension of the comparison made in the parable. The parable answers the question from two points of view, subjectively and objectively, and brings out the difference between an objective comprehension of the kingdom of God—the purpose and ways of God—and a subjective comprehension of the kingdom of God—the possibility of every man to enter it.

Matt. xiii. 1: Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς αἰκίας, ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

Jesus went out of the house and sat down by the seashore.

2: Καὶ συνέχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν

And the multitude of people

ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλῆθον ἐμβάντα καθήσθαι καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιάλόν εἰστήκει.

that came together around him was so great, that he put off a little way in a boat. And the people stood on the shore.

3: Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλά ἐν παραβολαῖς, λέγων· Ἰδοὺ ἐξήλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν.

And he said: Behold, a sower began to sow.

Mark iv. 4: Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

And some of the seeds fell on the roadways, and the birds came and pecked them up.

5: Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρώδες, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν· καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.

Others fell on stones, and soon began to spring up and to sprout.

6: Ἡλίον δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

But as soon as the sun rose high, they were scorched, because they had no root, and withered away.

7: Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκανθαὶ, καὶ συνέπιπζαν αὐτῇ, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε.

Others fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up and choked them, and they yielded no fruit.

8: Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν· καὶ ἐτοῖον καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξάνοντα· καὶ ἔφερεν ἢ τριάκοντα, καὶ ἢ ἐξήκοντα, καὶ ἢ ἑκατόν.

And some fell on good ground, and put forth ears, and bore fruit; some thirty-fold, some sixty, and some a hundred.

9: Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούτω.

And he said to them: He who has understanding, let him understand.

Intelligence was sent from on high by some Being, and appeared in this boundless confused world of men. It was sown in the hearts of all men just as a countless number of seeds are sown by the sower over the whole space of his field some of which fall on a roadway, some on stones, and some among thorns.

The sower knows that there are stones, roadways, and thorns in his field and that many of the seeds will perish, but he also knows that it is profitable to sow the whole of his field, since even if many perish, the larger number of the seeds will strike root and grow up, and there will be a harvest. It is exactly in this fashion that intelligence is sown in man. Those countless seeds will not all equally contribute to the harvest, a small quantity will be lost, and these are not wanted by him, but the rest will give, some a hundredfold, some sixty, and some thirty. And so the life of intelligence is sown in all men, some lose this life, but others render it back a hundredfold.

The sower sowed seed, and he has need only of seed, and will gather in only seed. The unknown sower sows the life of intelligence, and he will gather in only the life of intelligence. The sower has need only of those who have the life of intelligence, but he has no need of those who have wasted and lost it. The seeds were all alike seeds, but some perished in the seed, others in the growth, and others in the blade. And so is it with men, some quickly waste and soon lose the life of intelligence; others more slowly and gradually. Only those who guard and preserve within them intelligence, so that it does not cease to be life, to be that from which they sprang, they only live, but the rest perish.

Such is the objective meaning of the parable. Some

men, like the seed, have fallen on a bad soil, and these are, as it were, predestined to perish; whilst others are, as it were, predestined to a plentiful life. But when Jesus first spake this parable, he did not fail to add this warning: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear"; using those same words which he always employs when there is a possibility of falsely understanding his words, and when their meaning may be taken in a double sense.

In the second Parable of the Sower we are also taught how to understand the purpose and ways of God in the share he takes in the affairs of mankind.

Mark iv. 26: Καὶ ἔλεγεν· Οὗτος ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ἐάνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπέρμα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν·

And he said: The kingdom of God is as if a man should cast seed into the ground;

27· Καὶ καθεύδῃ, καὶ ἡγερῇται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν· καὶ ὁ σπέρμα βλαστάνῃ, καὶ μηκύνῃται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.

He himself sleeps in the night and rises in the day, and all the while the seed grows up, he knows not how.

28· Αὐτομάτῃ γὰρ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χορτόν, ἔπειτα στάχυν, ἔπειτα πλήρη σίτου ἐν τῇ στάχυν.

The earth of its own nature shoots forth the seed, first the blade, then the ear, and then fills up the ear with corn.

29· Ὅταν δὲ παραδῇ ὁ καρπός, εὐθέως ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ἵνα παρίστην ὁ θερισμός.

And when the seed is fully ripe, he immediately sends reapers, seeing that the season of harvest is come.

Intelligence gives man life, but God, the source of intelligence, God whom no one has conceived, does not control and rule men like the peasant who sowed the

seed and troubled himself no further about it. He knows only his own, and adopts it—this intelligence. For, in the same way as the sower gathers in from his field the seed he has sown, is intelligence in man united with the source of intelligence.

This same idea is set forth in the Parable of the Leaven.

#### VII. PARABLE OF THE LEAVEN

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Matt. xiii. 33: Ἀλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁμοίᾳ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.</p> | <p>The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and put into a measure of meal, till all the leaven in the kneading-trough had well risen.</p> |
|--|---|

The woman put in the leaven and left it in the kneading-trough to become sour, till the paste was ready. It was not necessary for her to do anything. This was enough to obtain the result she desired. As the ground of its own nature shoots forth the seed, and as the leaven rises of itself, so the life of intelligence has its own inherent force, lives, and is not extinguished.

And once more this idea is expressed in the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, but with a new and profound meaning, giving a direct answer to the question so often put by men: "What is evil, and how are we to understand evil, and what should be our relation to it?"

#### VIII. PARABLE OF THE WHEAT AND TARES

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Matt. xiii. 24: Ἀλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων·</p> | <p>And Jesus said: Behold, what the kingdom of heaven may</p> |
|---|---|

Ὁμοιωθὴ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν  
ἀνθρώπῳ σπείροντι καλὴν σπέρμα ἐν  
τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ.

be likened. A householder sowed  
his field with good seed.

25 : Ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τὸν  
ἀνθρώπου, ἤλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρός,  
καὶ ἔσπειρε ζιζάνια· ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ  
σίτου καὶ ἀτήληεν.

In the night an enemy came,  
sowed darnel among the wheat,  
and went his way.

1. Ζιζάνιον, a plant exactly resembling wheat till  
it ears.

Matt. xiii. 26. "Ὅτε δὲ ἐξηλάσ-  
τησεν ὁ χόστος, καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίη-  
σεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια.

And, behold, when the wheat  
began to ear, and bear fruit,  
there appeared also the darnel.

27 : Προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δούλοι τοῦ  
οἰκονομήτου εἶπον αὐτῷ· Κυριε, οὐχὶ  
καλὴν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ ᾧ  
ἀγρῷ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει τὰ ζιζάνια;

The labourers came to the  
householder, and said : Didst  
thou sow bad seed in thy field?  
For a quantity of darnel has  
grown up there.

28 : Ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Ἐχθρός  
ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. Οἱ δὲ  
δούλοι εἶπον αὐτῷ· Θέλεις οὖν ἀπελ-  
θάντες συλῆξωμεν αὐτά;

And the householder said : It  
is not I, but some stranger, who  
has done this. The labourers  
said : Wilt thou that we go and  
weed out the darnel?

29 : Ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Οὐ· μήποτε συλ-  
λέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια, ἐκριζώσῃτε ἅμα  
αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον.

And he said : It is not well to  
weed it out. For if you begin  
now to pluck up the darnel, you  
will spoil the wheat.

30 : Ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφο-  
τέρω μέχρι τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ  
καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς·  
συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ

Let the wheat and the darnel  
grow together till the harvest,  
and then I will bid the reapers  
to gather the darnel together and

ῥήσατε αὐτά εἰς δέσμας, πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά· τὸν δὲ σῖτον πυραγάγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου.

burn it, and then to gather the wheat into my barn.

What is here said as to the householder burning all that is useless to him, and gathering into his barn the corn which he requires, is a repetition of John the Baptist's words: "His shovel is in his hand, and he will purify his threshing-floor. The wheat he will gather in, and the chaff he will burn." But here we are told that he who will destroy all that is worthless and gather in all that is required, is the same as he who shall purify with the spirit: the son of man.

Matt. xiii. 36: Τότε ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἤρξαντο εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ· ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα, ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

And the disciples began to ask Jesus: Interpret to us this parable of the dandel in the field.

37: Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα, ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

And Jesus said to them: The householder who sows the good seeds is the son of man.

38: Ὁ δὲ ἀγρὸς, ἔστιν ὁ κόσμος· τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ ζιζάνια, εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

The field is the world of mankind: the good seeds are the sons of the kingdom of God: and evil men are the dandel.

39: Ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτά, ἔστιν ὁ διάβολος· ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος ἔστιν· οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ, ἄγγελοι εἰσιν.

The stranger is temptation: the harvest is the end of man's earthly life: and the reapers are the powers of God.

40: Ὡς περ εὖν συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ πυρὶ κατακαίεται· οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.

As the dandel is gathered together and burned, so shall it be at the end of man's earthly life.

41: Ἀποστέλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα, καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν.

The Son of man will send his labourers, and they shall weed out from among the children of his kingdom every he, and all who do evil.

1. The present tense, it will be observed, is here employed. It is not said, he will weed "all who *have done ill*," as would have been the case if the words referred to the end of the world, as the Church interprets the passage, but it is said, "all who *do ill*"; that is to say, men in doing ill thereby exclude themselves from the kingdom of God, as we have already been told in the discourse with Nicodemus.

Matt. xiii. 42: Καὶ βαλῶσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· καὶ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν οὐρῶντων.

1. Ἐκεῖ signifies *there*, and also *then*. Here it is used in the latter sense, as also in Luke xiii. 28, where we have the same phrase repeated. The meaning of the passage is, that when it will be too late, there will be many who will weep and gnash their teeth with vexation at the thought of their folly in not having lived a life of intelligence.

Matt. xiii. 43: Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Ὁ ἔχων ὅτι ἀκούειν, ἀκούτω.

And then shall the righteous shine like a sun in the kingdom of their Father. He who has understanding, let him understand.

The spirit of God—the son of man, in whom is



revealed all that we know of God—gives the life of intelligence to men, even as the householder gives good seed to the ground in his field, and it grows. But in the midst of this life of intelligence appears something closely resembling life, but ending in death. And so it is said in Luke xiv. 26: "And that which he seemed to have shall be taken away." Now what is this that resembles life so closely? Whence does it come?

The question does not concern God the Spirit, but men. God the Spirit is the source of life, and sows life, and gathers in life. Only the foolish labourer can advise the destruction and trampling out of life. For life is the one thing needful, the one thing that will remain, the one thing laid up for God.

The temporary life, like all that is temporary, comes to an end, perishes, and passes. But the life of intelligence never ends, and cannot perish, since it is the one thing that is spirit, the one thing that, comes from God.

In this parable we have two leading ideas, two answers to the questions: "What is evil in relation to God?" and, "What is evil in relation to man?"

The answer to the first question is, that in relation to God there can be no evil; he is God of life and happiness, and knows not evil. Inasmuch as he is God of life and good, he cannot desire to destroy life, and there can be no evil for him. The desire to destroy life is evil, and this can only exist in man, but not in God.

This conclusion, to which the second idea naturally leads us, is here only partially set forth, but will be more fully developed in Christ's exposition of his law: "Resist not evil."

The son of man gives life and recognises life only in intelligence, and therefore the man who commits his life to the son, to the spirit, cannot know evil, and consequently cannot resist it.

The answer here given to the second question, "What is that which men call evil?" is based on the idea that what we call evil is the voluntary departure from the light, and consequent destruction; of which we read in the discourse with Nicodemus,—how the light came into the world, but men strayed far away from it.

The idea that in relation to God there is no evil, and that in relation to man it is the departure from intelligence, is set forth in the Parable of the Fishing-Net.

#### IX. PARABLE OF THE FISHING-NET

Matt. xiii. 47: Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγγήνῃ βληθείσῃ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ·

Again, the kingdom of God is like unto a fishing-net, which was let down into the water, and brought up every kind of fish.

48: Ἦν, ὅτε ἐπληρώθη, ἀναβιβάσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν, καὶ καθίσαντες, συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ὀγγεῖα, τὰ δὲ σὰπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον.

And when the net was full they dragged it up on to the shore, sat down, and sorted the fish. And the good fish they collected in a vessel, and the useless fish they throw away.

God acts like these fisherman who throw away the fish that are useless to them, and keep only those they require. The fish of which they are in need are picked out and preserved; the rest are thrown back into the sea, because they are not wanted. There is no question about whether they are better or worse. The fish thrown

away into the sea are not the fish the fishermen want; just as those men are not required by God who are not his sons, and whose life is not in the light of intelligence. For God there is nothing evil, but for men there is evil. The evil for men is life apart from intelligence.

We must therefore distinguish between our conception of evil in general—objective evil—and of evil for each man—subjective evil. There is no objective evil. Subjective evil is departure from intelligence, and this is death.

This distinction between the two points of view is laid down in the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower and the Seed which fell on different soils.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Matt. xiii. 10: Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταί, εἶπον αὐτῷ· Διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς;</p> | <p>And his disciples came to him and asked:</p> |
|---|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Luke viii. 9: Τίς εἰη ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη;</p> | <p>To what purpose dost thou speak parables?</p> |
|---|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Mark iv. 10: Ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν τὴν παραβολήν.</p> |  |
|---|--|

In Mark and Luke the disciples are represented as asking: "What does this parable mean?" In Matthew they ask: "Wherefore dost thou speak in parables?"

I think that in Mark and Luke it is intended that we should understand the disciples to ask: "What does the parable mean, and to what purpose has it been spoken?" Matthew's version also signifies: "To what purpose dost thou speak parables, and what do they mean?" And Jesus in his answer replies to both these questions. He interprets the parable, and from his explanation of its meaning is drawn the conclusion that it is impossible

to speak to those who do not know the mysteries of the kingdom of God otherwise than by examples, as in parables. The truth must be imparted to them objectively, and the subjective truth they cannot see.

In Matthew it is said: *διὰ τὴν ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς*. The word *αὐτοῖς* is wanting in many copies, and there is no substantive in the sentence to which it can refer. It has evidently been interpolated, because the interrogative *διὰ τὴν* is applied to both parable itself and to the speaking in parables. *Διὰ τὴν* in this place corresponds with the German *warum*, and signifies *wherefore*.

The disciples ask wherefore he speaks these parables. This is the sense given in Mark and Luke, and for this reason *αὐτοῖς* is superfluous, and for the same reason the verses 11 to 23 do not form an occasional discourse, but are an interpretation of the parable. I have therefore harmonised the ideas conveyed by the question and answer as given in the three Gospels, and have translated the passage: "To what purpose dost thou speak parables?" In this way the question refers both to the meaning of the parable and to the reason why he speaks to the people in parables.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Matt. xiii. 11: Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· "Ὅτι ὑμῖν δοῦνται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται. | He answered them and said: For this reason, because to you it has been given to know the inner meaning of the kingdom of God. |
|---|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Mark iv. 11: Ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνονται. | But to those who are without it is presented in parables. |
|---|---|

To you it has been given to know the inner meaning of the kingdom of heaven; you are the good soil which

bears fruit a hundredfold, sixtyfold, thirtyfold. But to these it has not been given, they are the roadways, the stones, and the thorns.

And this is the meaning of the parable. To some the inner truth is revealed, and to others not. Thus he says: "The reason why I speak to them in parables is, that since they do not understand the inner meaning, they cannot understand otherwise than parabolically." In Luke it is said. "To you it has been given to know the inner meaning of the kingdom of God, but to the rest in parables."

Matt xiii 13. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ | For this reason I speak with  
παρὰβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ.<sup>1</sup> | them in parables.

1. *Λαλεῖν* to speak, to communicate. Here it would be more correct to translate it, to speak with, to communicate with, as this place corresponds with that in Mark and Luke, where it is said: "But to them all these things are represented in parables." The idea is not, "therefore I speak to them in parables," but, "therefore they cannot understand otherwise than in parables." Διὰ τοῦτο shows that what is said is an answer to the question διατί. After the word λαλῶ a full stop or semicolon should be placed. This will then give a different sense to the one formerly adopted, that Jesus spake to them in parables because they did not understand, that is, spake to them indirectly by illustrations and comparisons expressly that they should not understand; but an exactly opposite meaning will be given to the passage, namely, that, being ignorant of the inner meaning of the kingdom of God, they could not understand it save in an outward form in parables.

I have therefore taken the first half of the verse from Matthew (xiii. 11), and the second half from Mark (iv. 11).

Matt. xiii. 9 : Ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούτω. He that has understanding, let him understand.

14 : Καὶ ἀναπληροῦται ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἰσαίου, ἡ λέγουσα· Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ᾔδητε. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah : With hearing you shall hear, and not understand : and with your eyes you shall see, but shall not perceive (Isa. vi. 9).

15 : Ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ βαρέαι ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι, καὶ τὴν καρδίαν συνιώσι, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς. For the heart of this people has grown fat, and they have closed their eyes, so that they should not see, neither do they hear with their ears, or conceive in their hearts that they should be converted, and that I should heal them (Isa. vi. 10).

16 : Ὡς δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσιν· καὶ τὰ ὠτα ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἀκούει. Blessed are your eyes, that they see ; and your ears, that they hear.

17 : Ἀμὲν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπέθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ὃ βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ ἔδον· καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ὃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. Verily, I say unto you, that prophets and holy men have desired to know that which you see, and could not know it, and to hear that which you have heard.

#### X. EXPLANATION OF THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

Matt. xiii. 18 : Ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατέ τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπειρόντος. Hear now the interpretation of the parable of the sower.

· Luke viii. 11: Ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

The seed is the intelligence of God.

Matt. xiii. 19: Παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς, καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς.

When a man hears the doctrine of the kingdom of God, and does not receive it into his heart, the enemy comes and takes away that which was born in his heart. This is the seed that was sown on the roadway.

20: Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς πετράδων σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ εὐθύς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν·

The seed sown on stones is he who hears the doctrine of the kingdom of God, understands the doctrine, and with gladness receives it into his heart;

21: Οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστι· γενομένη, δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθύς σκανδαλίζεται.

But it takes no root within him, except for a while. And when oppression and offences come, because of the doctrine, he at once gives himself up to a lie.

22: Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων· καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἵωνος τούτου, καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου συμπίνγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἀκαρπὸς γίνεται.

And that which was sown among thorns, is he who receives the doctrine; but earthly cares and the love of riches choke the doctrine, and it brings forth no fruit.

23: Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καλὴν σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ συνιάν· ὃς δὲ καρποφορεῖ. καὶ ποιεῖ, ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὁ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα.

But that which fell on good soil, is he who understands the doctrine, and receives it into his heart; and it brings forth fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixty, and some thirty.

Luke viii. 18: Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε· ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἔχη, δοθήσεται

Take heed, therefore, how you understand. He who keeps the

αὐτῷ· καὶ ὁ δὲ ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ doctrine, to him shall be given ;  
 ἔχειν, ἀρρήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.<sup>1</sup> but he who keeps it not, even  
 that which seems to be in him  
 shall be taken away.

1. *Οὐδ* signifies *non*, and is here used in that sense.

2. In many copies we have *ἀγάπη*, which makes the meaning clearer, simpler, and more correct.

3. *Ἐχειν* signifies *to keep*. This expression corresponds with the Russian saying: You may safely fill a well-sewn sack, but all to the last seed will run out of a bad sack.

4. This verse is given in Matthew xiii. 12 in the same form.

The disciples ask to what purpose he speaks these parables, and what he wishes to teach by them? And Jesus answers: "To you alone it has been given to understand the kingdom of God, even as it was given to those seeds alone to grow that fell on good soil. To the rest, as with the seeds that perished, this has not been given. And to you, as to the seeds on the good soil, it has been given to live and to increase; but from them shall be taken away even the life that seemed to be within them, in the same way as the seeds perished that fell on the roadway, on stones, or among thorns. And this I tell in parables, because they do not see or understand true happiness. They are like the people of whom Isaiah says that God has punished them in that they shall see but not perceive, and shall hear but not understand. For the heart of these people has grown fat,



and therefore they do not understand what is put before them. But you are happy in that you understand."

Such is the outward or objective meaning of the parable; but it has a different and inner meaning. And this second inner meaning Jesus explained to them.

The outward meaning of the parable is, that for God some men are predestined to death, others to life. But, according to its inner meaning, there is no such thing as predestination, and each man may keep the spirit of intelligence within him, and obtain life in plentifulness.

The seeds falling on the roadway are they who are callous and indifferent to a life of intelligence, and therefore Jesus warns us against indifference and callousness, and teaches us to strive earnestly that we may receive intelligence into our hearts.

The seeds falling on stones are they who are weak, and for this reason Jesus warns us against weakness, and points out that we must strive with strength not to be unsettled by offences and persecutions but to hold fast the doctrine.

The seeds falling among thorns are they who are taken up with the cares of the world; and Jesus warns us and teaches us that we must labour to estrange ourselves from all such cares, and cast them from us.

The seeds falling on good soil are they who understand and live up to the law and teaching of Christ, in spite of all offences and worldly cares.

And Jesus shows how he who thus labours and strives, shall receive a plenteous life.

## XI. PARABLE OF THE TREASURE.

Matt. xiii. 44: *Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρὸν κεκρυμμένον ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὗρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐκρυψε, καὶ ἀπο τῆς χαρᾶς ὑπάγει, καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει, πωλεῖ, καὶ ἀγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον.* The kingdom of God is like unto a treasure hidden in a field. And, behold, a man found this treasure, and hid it again. And for joy that he had found it, he went, and sold all that he had, and purchased the field.

45: *Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ ἐμπόρῳ, ζητοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας.* Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant, who buys up precious stones,

46: *Ὃς εὗρὼν ἓνα πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην, ἀπελθὼν πίπρακε ταῦτα ὅσα εἶχε, καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν.* And, having found one precious stone, goes, and sells all the precious stones he has, and purchase it.

The kingdom of God is like unto a man who desires to have a pearl, or some treasure, which he knows to be buried in a certain field. And, having known this, he sells all that he has, in order that he may buy the field, and with it, the pearl.

## XII. PARABLE OF THE MUSTARD SEED.

Matt. xiii. 31: *Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σιναιτικής, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ.* The kingdom of heaven is like unto a seed of mustard, which a man took, and sowed in his field.

32: *Ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων· ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ, μέγιστον τῶν λαχάδων ἐστί· καὶ γίνεται.* And, though the smallest of all seeds, when it is grown, it is the largest of all herbs, and becomes

δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κατασκευαῖν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. | a tree, and the winged birds of the air build their nests in its branches.

## XIII. RECAPITULATION

Jesus declares that the kingdom of God has come, but without noise or any outward demonstration. He declares to his disciples that from henceforth the kingdom of heaven is opened, and that there is now between heaven and men a free and constant communication. He declares that we are wrong to shun intercourse with fallen men and women; for these are not to be blamed, but only those who think themselves to be good, because they fulfil the law of God. He declares that all outward purification is unnecessary, since only what comes out of the heart of a man defiles him, and the spirit alone purifies. He declares that it is not needful to observe sabbaths; that their observance is foolish, and deceitful, and that the sabbath is of man's institution. He declares that not only fasts and days of abstinence, but all the external forms and rites of the old religion, are destructive to his teaching. And lastly, he declares that we are not called upon to serve God with sacrifices. Oxen, sheep, doves, money, the temple itself,—none of these things is any longer required. God is a spirit, and he does not desire sacrifice, but love; and thus, he is to be served and worshipped in spirit and works of love by all, at all times, and in all places.

When the Pharisees saw and heard these things, they come to Jesus and begin to ask him, how it is he who denies God still preaches a kingdom of God? And he answered them: "The kingdom of God I preach is not

that which the earlier prophets preached. They announced that the kingdom of God would come with different signs and manifestations; but I tell you of a kingdom of God whose advent is visible to none. And if men say unto you, 'Behold it has come,' or, 'Behold it is here, or there,' believe them not. The kingdom of God is not a thing of time or of any particular place, but it shines like the lightning, here, there, and everywhere; for it knows neither time nor place, but is within you."

And after this, one of the Pharisees, an elder in Israel, Nicodemus by name, came secretly to Jesus, and said to him: "Thou teachest that the kingdom of God is come, and that it is within us, and thou commandest us not to fast, not to offer up sacrifices, and to destroy the temple; what, then, is this thy kingdom of God, and where is it?" And Jesus answered him and said: "Know this, if a man has been conceived of God the Father, he shall verily see the kingdom of God." But Nicodemus did not understand what Jesus meant when he said that *"every man has already been conceived of God"*; and he could only reply by asking, how a man who had already been conceived from a father in the flesh, and had grown old, could once more enter into the womb of his mother, and be again conceived in the flesh by God? And Jesus answered: "Understand what I say. I say that every man is conceived, not only in the flesh, but also in the spirit; and, therefore, every man is of the flesh and of the spirit, and thus every man can enter the kingdom of God. That which is of the flesh is flesh. The spirit cannot be born of flesh, for the spirit can be born only of spirit. The spirit is that which lives in you, and lives freely and intelligently, and is without beginning or end. And this each man feels to be within him. Why, then,

marvel if I tell you that we must be conceived from heaven, of God, of the spirit?" To these words Nicodemus rejoined: "Nevertheless, I do not believe this can be." Then Jesus said to him: "What kind of teacher art thou, if thou canst not understand this? Know that I am telling you nothing marvellous, but only what we all know, and what, I affirm to you, we all see. But how will you believe in things of heaven if you do not believe in a thing of the earth, a thing that has taken place in yourself. No one has ever been in heaven, and it is only on earth that the son of God, the same spirit that is God, is in man."

We must, then, honour this same son of God in man, as men before honoured God; and as Moses in the wilderness set up, not the serpent in flesh, but its image, and this image was made the salvation of men; so must the son, God in man, be set up, not the flesh of man, but the son of God in man, that men, trusting in him, may not know death, but have life without end in the kingdom of God. It is evident that God gave his son, who is even such as he himself, not for the destruction, but for the happiness, of the world. He gave his son, that everyone who commits himself to him may not perish, but have life without end. It is not to destroy the world that God has begotten his son—that is, life—into the world of mankind, but that all men may have life by him, and themselves become sons of the kingdom of God. For he who trusts in the son is in the kingdom of God—in the power of God; and he who does not trust, destroys himself by not trusting in that which is life. Man's destruction consists in this, that life is come into the world, but men have wilfully strayed from life. Life is the light of men. The light came into the

world, but men have preferred darkness to light, and have not gone to the light. The light is intelligence, and he who does ill, thereby shuns and avoids light and intelligence, lest his deeds should be seen, and he also remains in the power of God.

In his replies to the Pharisees, and in his discourse with Nicodemus, Jesus explains what he understands by the kingdom of God, and by God.

Both God and God's kingdom reign within men. Life is given to men by God, and its source is not of the flesh. This source, which is not of the flesh, he calls the son of God in man, or the son of man. The son of man is intelligence. We must exalt it, deify it, and live by it. He who lives in intelligence, lives without end; and he who does not live in it has no life, but perishes.

What, then, is this God the Father, who is not, as the Jews formerly conceived him to be, the Creator of all things, a Being existing apart from and above the world? How are we to understand the Father, whose son is in man; and how should we understand his relation to men?

To this question Jesus answers in parables.

We must not suppose the kingdom of God means a kingdom will come for all men at a certain time and in a certain place, but we must understand that in the world there always are those who trust in the son of God, and thus make themselves sons of the kingdom, and others who do not trust in him, and are lost. God the Spirit, Father of the spirit that is in man, is the God and Father only of those who confess themselves to be his sons. And, therefore, only those exist for God who have kept that within them which he gave them.

And Jesus began to speak of the kingdom of God, and it was by examples drawn from men and their lives that he spoke of it. Thus, he said that God the Father sows the life of intelligence in the world, exactly as a householder sows seed in his field. He sows the whole field, not choosing any particular place on which to let the seed fall. And some of the seeds fall on the roadway, and birds fly down and peck it up. Other seeds fall on stones, and though the seeds spring up, they quickly perish, because there is no place for their roots to strike deep. And others fall among thorns and darnel, that choke the corn, and the ears sprout, but cannot fill up. But some of the seeds fall on good soil, and these grow up and compensate for the seeds that are lost, and give forth rich and well-filled ears, producing some a hundred-fold, some sixty, and some thirty.

It is thus God sows intelligence in men. In some it perishes, in others it increases a hundredfold, and these form the kingdom of God.

The kingdom of God is not, then, as Nicodemus thought, the rule of God over men. God only sows intelligence, and the kingdom of God will be in those who receive it. But God does not rule or direct men.

The householder sows his seeds, and lets them grow, and the seeds of themselves will swell, sprout up, become clothed with green, and laden with ears filled with grain. And only when they are well ripened does the householder send reapers to cut down the corn in the field.

And so God gave his son, intelligence, to the world, and intelligence of itself grows in the world, and the sons of intelligence form the kingdom of God.

Like a woman who puts leaven into a tub, and mixes it with the flour, but waits till it has of itself turned

sour and risen, so, whilst a man is living, God does not meddle with his life. God gave intelligence to the world, and intelligence lives of itself in men and forms the kingdom of God. God the Spirit is God of life and good, and there is for God neither death nor evil. Death and evil are for men, but not for God.

Such is the kingdom of God. The householder sowed good seed in his field. The householder is the spirit of God; the field is the world; the seeds are the sons of the kingdom of God. When the householder had finished his work, he lay down to sleep, and, during his slumber an enemy came and sowed tares and darnel. The enemy is temptation; the darnel is the sons of temptation. Then his labourers came to the householder and said: "Didst thou sow bad seed, that so much darnel has sprung up in thy field? Let us go and weed it out." But he answered and said: "Not so; for if you begin now to weed out the darnel, you will injure the wheat. Let them both grow together, and when the harvest-time comes I will order the reapers to collect the darnel and to burn it, but to gather the wheat into my barn." The harvest is the end of man's life; the reapers are the powers of God. And as they burn the darnel, but gather in and sift the wheat, so at the end of man's life all the deceits of time pass away, and nothing but true life remains in the soul. There is for God no evil. God will preserve that which he requires, that which is his; but all that is not from him is not for him.

The kingdom of God is like a fishing-net. The net is let down into the sea, and in it are caught all kinds of fish. But when it is drawn up, the fishermen pick out the worthless fishes and throw them back into the sea.



So will it be at the end of man's earthly life. The powers of God will pick out what is good and cast away what is evil.

And when Jesus had finished speaking, his disciples come and ask him the meaning of these parables. And he said to them: "These parables must be understood in a twofold sense. And I have spoken all these parables, because there are some, like you, who are my disciples, who understand wherein the kingdom of God consists, that it is within each man, and understand how it is to be entered; but the rest do not understand this. For though they see, they do not perceive; and though they hear, they do not understand: for their hearts have grown fat. And therefore I speak these parables in a twofold sense: in one sense to them, and in another sense to you. I tell them what is God's kingdom, and that some enter it, but others do not; and this they can understand. But you I tell how men may enter the kingdom of God. And take good heed that you will understand the Parable of the Sower. This is its meaning for you. Everyone who hears the doctrine of the kingdom of God, but does not receive it into his heart, he shall be beset by lies, and the doctrine shall be rooted out of him: this is the seed that fell on the roadway. That which fell on stones, is he who hears the word and gladly receives it. But it does not strike root within him, he receives it only for a time, and he is offended the instant he has to suffer from oppression or persecution for sake of the doctrine. The seed sown among thorns, is he who hears the doctrine; but worldly cares and desire for wealth choke the doctrine, and it yields no fruit. The seed sown on good soil, is he who hears the doctrine, understands it, and brings forth fruit to a

hundredfold, to sixty, or to thirty. He, therefore, who keeps the doctrine, to him much shall be given; but he who does not keep the doctrine, all to the very last shall be taken from him. And therefore take heed how you understand the parable. Understand it so that you do not yield to lies, offences, or cares, but that, bringing forth fruit a hundredfold, you may enter the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God grows up from nothing, but yields and produces everything. It is like a seed of mustard, the smallest of all seeds, but which, when grown up, is the greatest among herbs, and the birds of the air build their nests in its branches."

After this, the disciples of John come to Jesus, and ask him, whether the kingdom of God be already come, whether he be the one of whom John had preached, and whether men be now renewed in spirit?

And Jesus answered them and said: "See and hear whether the kingdom of God be come, and whether men be renewed in spirit, and then go and tell John how I preach the kingdom of God. In the prophets it is said that, when the kingdom of God is come, all men shall be blessed. And now, tell him that my kingdom of God is such that the poor are blessed, and all who hear me are made blessed."

And when he had sent away the disciples of John, he began to speak to the people of the kingdom of God, which John had preached.

And he said: "When you went to John in the wilderness to be washed, what did you go to see? If you went to see a man clad in rich robes, such you have among you, and can see in their palaces. But what went you out to see? Do you think you went because John was a prophet? Not so; John was no prophet, but he

of whom the prophets wrote. He it was who announced the coming of the kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you: There has been no man born greater than John. He was in the kingdom of God, and therefore he was greater than all others. The law and the prophets were requisite till John came, but now and from henceforth the kingdom of God is proclaimed in the world, and he who strives may enter into it. The lawyers and Pharisees have not understood what John preached. And they counted him as a man that is nothing worth. For these men, the lawyers and Pharisees, accept as true only what they themselves teach. They repeat by heart their law, and follow one another. But that which John proclaimed, and that which I teach, they refuse to hear, and do not understand. All that they have understood of John's preaching is that he fasted in the wilderness and therefore they say he is possessed. And all they understand of my teaching is that I came not fasting; and therefore they say he eats and drinks with tax-collectors, and is the friend of fallen men and women. They are like chattering children in the street, and are astonished that no one hearkens to them. By their deeds they show their wisdom. Behold, all that I teach you is easy and simple; for, in proclaiming the kingdom of God, I announce true happiness to men."

## CHAPTER IV

### THE LAW: THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

#### I. RICH AND POOR

Matt. ix. 35. Καὶ περιήγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις τὰς καὶ τὰς towns and villages, and taught in  
 κάμας, ἡγούμενος ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, the synagogues, proclaiming and  
 αὐτὰν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον preaching the presence of God  
 τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ θεραπεύων πάντας healing men.  
 νόσους<sup>1</sup> καὶ πάντας μαλακίας ἐν τῇ  
 λαῷ.

1. I omit in my translation the words, "healing all kinds of diseases," as being unnecessary, relating as they do to certain miracles that are supposed to be a testimony to the truth of Christ's teaching.

Matt. ix. 36: Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν. And Jesus, looking on the  
 ὅτι ἦσαν ἐκλελυμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι, people, took pity on them, be-  
 ὥσει πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. cause they were like ill-con-  
 ditioned sheep that have no shepherd.

37: Τότε λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς  
 αὐτοῦ· Ὁ μὲν θείσμιός ποτὶς  
 εἰ δὲ ἐργάταις ὄλητοι·

38: Δεήθηται οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ

θερεισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς  
τὸν θερεισμόν αὐτοῦ.

Matt. v. 1: Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους,  
ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ καθίσαντος  
αὐτοῦ, προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ  
αὐτοῦ.

Luke vi. 20: Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας  
τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μα-  
θητάς<sup>1</sup> αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγε· Μακάριοι οἱ  
πτωχοί·<sup>2</sup> ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐστὶν ἡ βασι-  
λεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.<sup>3</sup>

21: Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν·  
ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.

And when Jesus saw the  
people, he went up on to a  
mountain, and sat down there;  
and his disciples came to him.

And, having lifted up his eyes  
on his disciples, he said: Blessed  
are the poor and vagrant; for  
yours is the kingdom of God.

Blessed are those who hunger  
now; for you shall be filled.

1. It must not be forgotten that, when in Matthew it is said that before Jesus began to speak his disciples came to him, and in Luke it is said that, having lifted up his eyes on his disciples, he began to speak, we are to understand that Jesus speaks to the people, but his discourse is addressed to the disciples. And so in Luke he says: "Blessed are the poor; for yours is the kingdom of God," including them and himself among the number of the poor and vagrant.

2. In Matthew we have "the poor in spirit"; whilst in Luke we have simply "the poor." Has this word *πνεύματι* been left out in Luke, or is it an interpolation in Matthew? To decide this, we must first understand the meaning of *πνεύματι* in this place.

This is what the Church teaches in explanation of the word "spirit." I quote from the *Commentary on the Gospels* by the Archimandrite Michael:—

“‘*Blessed.*’ The explanations that follow of each particular beatitude show what kind of blessing is here intended, namely, the blessing of the kingdom of the Messiah.”

“‘*Poor in spirit.*’ That is, humble in spirit. To be poor in spirit is to have a humble appreciation of one’s spiritual qualities, to humble one’s self, to count one’s self a sinner; the quality of humility being opposed to that of pride, vanity, or self-love. In the same way as Adam fell through pride, counting himself to be like God, Christ exalts us by the practice of the virtue of humility. The word spirit is added in order that we may understand Christ to mean humility and not poverty. But why, then, did He not say humble instead of poor? Because the second expression is less emphatic and complete than the former.

“‘*Theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*’ This means, they are able and worthy to live in the kingdom of heaven: for the humble man, by acknowledging his sinfulness and unworthiness, commits himself to the guidance of divine mercy, in no wise trusting to his own spiritual strength; and divine mercy brings him to the kingdom. Humility is the gate to the heavenly kingdom.”

And this is what Reuss says on the passage under consideration:—

“In general these beatitudes exalt the state of those who prefer life in God and peace with heaven to the pleasures of this world. Experience proves that to choose these states is painful and difficult, inasmuch as our natural human weakness is like to founder on one of two rocks, both equally dangerous and equally formidable. On the one hand, we are exposed to the antipathy of the

world that has only contempt and hate for all that is different to itself. On the other hand, there is the natural pride of the human mind and the evil propensities of the human heart, which are for ever tempting us, and leading us astray from the path of salvation. This is why Jesus calls those blessed who know how to avoid these rocks, to conquer their vicious affections, to recognise the inherent imperfection of their nature, to brave the seductions and threats of a perverse and hostile world, and to endure in patience all the trials and tribulations to which such a resolution, courageously taken and carried out, must expose us."

All this may be very profound, but these are the ideas of various Theophilactuses, Jeromes, Reusses, but not the ideas of Christ. For if Christ had wished to speak in this place of humility, he would have spoken out plainly and clearly, as he has done in many and numerous passages. It is evident that on this occasion Jesus did not wish to speak of humility. Firstly, the conjunction of these two terms, poverty and spirit, in one and the same sentence effectually deprives it of all meaning. *Πτωχός* signifies *poor, homeless, vagrant* (but not in the contemptuous sense we now generally give to the word); and we cannot talk about *vagrant in spirit*. Secondly, throughout the Gospels it is taught that we must exalt the spirit, and live in the spirit. How, then, could Jesus say that they who are poor in spirit are blessed? Thirdly, it is said in Matthew that the poor in spirit are blessed, and then follows an enumeration of other blessings that will result from being poor in spirit; but one of them, "hungering after righteousness," cannot be brought into harmony with humility. If the idea of

hungering after righteousness be not in direct antagonism to that of humility, at least it cannot be said to be a resulting consequence of it. Fourthly, all the following beatitudes, since it is only to the first that are added the words "for theirs is the kingdom of God," ought to be illustrations and explanations of the first. But the ideas, hungering after righteousness, almsgiving, purity of heart, cannot be said to have their origin in the idea of humility. And, lastly, the rewards for the practice of the virtues here enumerated are altogether opposed to the idea of humility: "seeing God, inheriting the earth, being called the children of God."

From all this it seems plain that the translation of *πτωχοί* by the word *humble* is incorrect, and that by adding *in the spirit* to the word *πτωχοί*, we deprive the sentence of all meaning.

We must now inquire into the meaning of *πτωχοί*, without the addition of the word *πνεύματι*.

According to Luke, Jesus said: "Blessed are you vagrants; because yours is the kingdom of heaven."

It may be that the meaning of these words is very different to that attributed to them by Jerome and the rich youth in the Gospel, as well as by the rich of all ages, past and present, who call themselves Christians, and plume themselves on being adherents of the Christian faith; but the meaning is, at anyrate, philologically precise. Jesus says that, according to his teaching, vagrants are blessed; and it was this he commissioned the disciples of John, who came to ask about his doctrine, to tell their master. This doctrine is in full harmony with the remainder of the discourse, in which are enumerated the sorrows experienced by vagrants, namely, *woe*, hunger, deportation. It is equally in full



accord with the general tenor of the whole Sermon on the Mount, and his teaching after the delivery of that sermon.

John was a beggar, a vagrant. Jesus also was all his life a vagrant. And he taught that the rich cannot enter into the kingdom of God, that we must put away all our possessions, and from the beginning to the end of the Sermon on the Mount he scarcely speaks of anything else. It begins with the declaration, 'blessed are the poor and vagrant,' and it ends with the invocation of the lesson that we must not hoard up for the future, but that we should live like the birds of the air or the fowls of the field.

We may therefore conclude that the word *πνεύματι* has not been omitted in Luke, but added in Matthew. But why and how was this word added to the text?

It may be that *μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* was the text-reading in some version of the Gospel, meaning that the poor and vagrant, in spite of their condition, are blessed in spirit. And this interpretation will explain the presence of the unexpected word *πνεύματι*. When the Gospels were recopied and revised, it is easy to understand how, under the influence of the same feeling that actuated the rich youth when he learned that the kingdom of heaven belonged to the homeless, this *πνεύματι* was referred to *πτωχοί*, and how many, like Jerome, explained that Jesus had expressly added "in spirit," in order that we might understand him to be speaking of the humble, and not of the poor. The result of this confused comprehension of these first words in Matthew has been that there have crept into some of the following verses (5 to 10) expressions that are not at all in accord with the first beatitude. Thus we read:

"Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth" (ver. 5). "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled" (ver. 6). "Blessed are the merciful; for they shall be pardoned" (ver. 7). "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God" (ver. 8). "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be named the sons of God" (ver. 9).

The ideas set forth in these verses--not to speak of the obscurity of some of them, or of the fact that they are mere repetitions of promises made to the Israelites in the Old Testament--only express what is said more emphatically and more appropriately in other portions of the Gospels than is the case here, where they have been introduced by chance, and are quite out of place.

We can understand that they were inserted to explain the meaning of the third verse, already obscured by the interpolation of the word *πνεύματι*: but in the clearer and simpler version of Luke they are plainly not wanted, and if introduced only spoil the sense. This is why I omit the word *πνεύματι* as well as these verses. And to make it clear that this omission in no way changes the idea conveyed in Christ's discourse, or introduces any new idea, I transcribe here the Church's commentary on the passage, as well as that of Reuss. Both in the one and the other we see how the commentators discover in it a meaning which does not admit of being expressed in other than dark and obscure terms.

This is what the Archimandrite writes--

"*Meek.*" Meekness is particularly shown in the patient endurance of wrongs done to us by others. It is not weakness of character, or indifference to one's lawful rights, or cowardice, but it is the opposite quality to anger,

malevolence, and revenge. The meek man endures wrong, because he is persuaded that God in His justice will Himself avenge him, should it be necessary. Meekness gives birth to peace, quells anger, and checks quarrels.

“*Shall inherit the earth.*” A figurative expression, probably borrowed from the inheritance of the promised land by the Jews. The promise that they should inherit the land of Canaan was regarded as a sign of heavenly favour and bliss. This expression is therefore used in the passage under consideration to signify, not earthly goods and possessions, but heavenly blessings, and particularly heavenly bliss in the life to come. But at the same time the sensible pleasures of this life are also included. As the meek may fear through their meekness to lose what is theirs, Christ promises that, on the contrary, he who is not insolent or puffed up shall possess his own in safety; whilst they who are such shall be deprived of their hereditary possessions and lose their soul. The promise here made by Christ signifies, therefore, that the meek shall enjoy perfect bliss in His kingdom, and this bliss they shall share in, both here below, on this earth, and in His kingdom above, in heaven.

“*Hungering and thirsting after righteousness.*” Hunger and thirst serve to signify a strong desire to receive some spiritual blessing. To be righteous is to be upright before God, to be justified by His righteous judgment through faith in the ransom made by the Lord Jesus. To hunger and thirst after righteousness signifies, then, to have a strong desire to be justified in the sight of God through faith in the Lord Christ, the Redeemer of the world.

“*Shall be filled*”; that is, with righteousness: they shall be counted righteous in the kingdom of the

Messiah, into which they shall be brought and admitted. If we are to understand righteousness in its stricter and narrower sense as opposed to cupidity, the promise, 'they shall be filled,' may apply even to reward in the flesh, since he who loves justice possesses his own in security. Such are filled even here, because they are contented with little, and shall receive still more abundantly in the life to come.

"*The merciful*': those who are touched by the misfortunes and sufferings of their fellow-creatures, and help them to the best of their power by their aid and counsel; those who regard their weaknesses with indulgence, or who give them that of which they most stand in need. For this they shall have mercy shown unto them. The Lord Himself will be merciful unto them, even as they have been merciful unto others. He will receive them into His kingdom, the highest and greatest sign of God's mercy to men. Moreover, they shall obtain mercy even from men in this world. To him who yesterday showed mercy and to-day is in poverty and misfortune, all will in their turn gladly show mercy.

"*Pure in heart*': they whose acts, thoughts, intentions, and moral rule of conduct are clean, unselfish, and just: in general, they who, by observing spiritual purity, have obtained complete purity, and have freed themselves from all double-dealing, and lead lives of purity; for, that we may see God, we have need only of this virtue, purity.

"*Shall see God*': not only spiritually, but with their bodily eyes in His manifestations; and not only in the world to come, where, in company with all the saints, they shall joy in seeing God face to face, but also in this

present life, when through purity of heart they shall be better able than others to see God in His glory, and to communicate with Him. As a glass can only reflect a figure when it is clean, so can the soul behold God and comprehend His word only when it is pure. This promise is not in contradiction with those places in the Scriptures where it is said no man can see God; for in such places the full vision and knowledge of God in His essence is spoken of, and this is impossible; but here, as often in the Scriptures, the vision of God by man is spoken of only as far as it can be acquired by man. For God reveals Himself to man in forms accessible to man's sight and intelligence, though He Himself is spirit.

“*Peacemakers*”: they who, living with others in this world, employ all their means and influence to establish and promote peace among men, and to prevent disputes and quarrels, and to reconcile those at variance. God is the God of peace, and they who promote peace among men in this more than in anything else are like God, and, therefore, worthy to be called sons of God. For they are followers and imitators of the God-man, who came upon earth expressly to make peace between God and man; and they are in this respect the true children of God.

“*Shall be named*”: that is, *shall really be such*.”

The following is taken from Reuss:—

“We think that all these qualities of the true disciple of Christ, as enumerated in the text, may easily be brought under this fundamental and simple idea. Poverty in spirit, then, is neither material misery piously supported, nor want of intellectual capacity. It is the exact contrary of that false wealth, which is essentially

the wealth of the man who imagines himself to be morally perfect, and to fulfil all his moral obligations towards God; and inasmuch as it is conscious of its deficiencies in this respect, it is eager to go to the true source of the good and the true. This term is frequently employed in the Psalms in an analogous sense. The other qualifications have no need of explanation, and we have only to justify the employment of the word *resigned* in place of *kind and gentle*, the terms employed by earlier commentators. This latter version is admissible as being in harmony with the terms *mercy* and *peaceful spirit*. But, as in the earlier portions of the sermon religious rather than social relationships are spoken of, and all is summed up and concentrated in the idea that we must act so as to be well with God, *gentleness* of disposition will express itself in submission to the supreme will, love of *peace* will manifest itself in self-denial, in patience, and in the renunciation of an aggressive or remunerative struggle with the world. And mercy itself—the word in Hebrew is identical with charity—comes within the same sphere of ideas. *Purity* of heart is naturally opposed to legal purity, to the pedantic practice of civil or formal duties. Lastly, *justice*, which in the Jewish sense of the word is the precise fulfilment of positive laws, will in the evangelical sense of the word be spiritual perfection, such as we find set forth in the subsequent portion of the sermon in a series of illustrative examples."

3. "Ὅτι ὑμετέρας ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ: that is, "To you it is accessible; you are already in the kingdom of God, because you are poor and vagrant. The kingdom of God is open to vagrants, but shut to the rich."

Luke vi. 21: Μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν ὅτι γελάσετε.

Blessed are they who weep now; for you shall laugh.

22: Μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφωρίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐνεδίωξι, καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρῶν, ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Blessed are you when men shall not honour you in anything, and when they shall shun you and reproach you, and condemn your conduct, and call you evil names, for the son of man's sake.

23: Χαίrete ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σικιτήσατε· ἰσοῦ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφῆταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy; for your service is great before God. So did their fathers unto the prophets.

24: Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις· ὅτι ἀπείχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.<sup>3</sup>

You are to be pitied, who are rich. You are to be pitied; because you deprive yourselves of the true consolation.

25: Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ ἐμπλησμένοι· ὅτι πεινάσετε. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν· ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

You are to be pitied, who are full; for you shall be poor. You are to be pitied, who laugh now; for you shall weep and lament.

26: Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφῆταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

You are to be pitied, when all men praise you; for even so did their fathers praise the false prophets.

1. Πλὴν, which points out something opposed to what goes before, shows that οὐαί, with a dative case, is in opposition to μακάριοι.

2. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν cannot be translated otherwise than, *you are to be pitied*.

3. The words, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν, are generally translated incorrectly, *have received your consolation*. Ἀπέχειν signifies, *to put away from one's self*; that is, "not to come into the kingdom of God." This expression corresponds with the words, "for yours is the kingdom of God." As all ulterior blessings are the result and consequence of poverty, so all ulterior calamities are here made to be the result of estranging ourselves from the consolation of the kingdom of God.

From all his teaching and from the parables which Jesus spake we draw this conclusion, that, to enter and attain the kingdom of God we must abandon all care for the life of the flesh.

John, who first preached the kingdom of God, lived in the wilderness. And Jesus also withdrew into the wilderness, and afterwards lived poor and homeless. And the principal lesson taught by his temptation is the renunciation of earthly goods.

The conversation with Simon and the sinning woman, the Parable of the Pharisee and Publican, the discourse concerning what it is that really defiles a man, and the discourse with Nicodemus, one and all teach us that nothing of the earth and of the flesh can bring us true happiness. The Parable of the Growth of the Seeds, in which we are told that the two great hindrances to the attainment of God's kingdom are the fear of persecution and the desire of wealth, also teaches that we must cast off and free ourselves from all earthly cares. The man who does this is poor.

In all this Jesus speaks of the outward state and condition to be accepted by all who would enter the kingdom of God. He expressly declares: "Blessed are



the poor; for theirs is the kingdom of God." And he says the same to the disciples of John, when he tells them that the poor and vagrant are blessed.

At first, Jesus taught by implication that men must not care for the things of this earth; but now, laying down the essential principle of his faith, he addresses himself to the people, and, expounding his doctrine in a way that shall be intelligible to all, plainly affirms that only the poor and vagrant can enter the kingdom of God, that the rich and well-filled and those who are well-spoken of cannot enter it, because riches, excessive possessions, and earthly glory estrange men from the kingdom of God; and all the rest of the Sermon on the Mount is but a proof and development of this thesis.

## II. THE SALT OF THE EARTH; THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD

Matt. v. 13: Ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς.<sup>1</sup> ἑάν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ,<sup>2</sup> ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθῆναι ἔξω, καὶ παταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

You are the salt of the whole world; but if the salt has lost its saltiness, wherewith shall it be salted? It is henceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and trodden under foot by men.

1. Γῆ, *the inhabited earth, the world*. I have therefore, translated it, *the whole world*.

2. Μωρανθῇ literally signifies, *has become foolish*; but cannot be so translated here, and must be rendered, *has become insipid, has lost its saltiness*. In Palestine there is a kind of salt which on exposure to the air quickly loses its strength and flavour. The passage, therefore, means: "You serve as salt to the world, you make it good. But

if the salt ceases to be that salt with which the world must be salted, wherewith can men be salted, that they may be made good?"

Matt. v. 14. Ἦμεῖς, ἑστὶν τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. Οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπ' ἀνὰ ὄρους κειμένη. A city that is built on a hill cannot be hid.

15: Οὐδὲ κτίσκει λόγῳ, καὶ τιθεῖσιν αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τὸν μύρον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῇν λυχνίαν, καὶ ἰσχύει φωθεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. And he who lights a candle does not put it under a bushel, but puts it in a candlestick, that it may light all who are in the room.

16: Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and may understand God your Father.

1. Δοξάζειν, *to think, to understand, to suppose.* It also signifies, in a figurative sense, *to glorify*; but this meaning is not suitable in this place.

The following is the Church's interpretation of the passage before us, as given by the Archimandrite Michael in his *Commentary*:—

"'You' refers both to the immediate disciples and hearers of the Lord and to the disciples of Christ in general, to all true Christians.

"'Salt of the earth': a figurative expression. Salt preserves eatables from being tainted, and serves to make food wholesome and tasteful. In the same way Christians ought, by their activity, by their conduct and example of life, to preserve the world from moral corruption, and decay, and to contribute to its moral

health. By their prayers they draw down God's blessing on the world, by their purity of life they exercise a moral influence on those by whom they are surrounded, and they must avert the complete falling away of the world into crime and vice by developing and strengthening among men healthy conceptions and ideas, that may serve as a sure foundation for moral activity.

"*If the salt lose its strength*": becomes saltless. This, of course, is impossible; but the Lord only presupposes such a thing: 'If it so happened that the salt lost its saltiness.' At the same time, travellers tell us that in these countries there is a kind of salt which can altogether lose its strength and become good for nothing save to be thrown away and trodden under foot by men. 'I broke off a piece of this kind of salt,' writes Mopdrel in his *Nach Palestina* (p. 162), 'and exposed it to the rain, the sun, and the air, and though a few salt particles were still to be distinguished, it completely lost its strength. Internally, as I proved by experiments, its strength was preserved.' This figurative expression signifies, then: 'If you, my disciples and the teachers of men, lose your inner moral strength and influence over the world, what can replace that strength and influence? Nothing. If you show yourselves powerless to renew the world, to preserve it from utter corruption, and to strengthen it, what must become of it, and what can give you the power and ability to renovate the world? Nothing; and you yourselves will perish, like salt that has lost its strength, and is cast out, and trodden under foot. And if a teacher will not instruct, persuade, and correct, but is idle in his work; such a teacher must be deprived of his authority, and exposed to contempt.'

"*You are the light of the world*": another, figurative

expression. The sun is called the light, or more correctly the luminary, of the world. The sun renders objects visible, and shows us their form and beauty, or ugliness, and quickens them. The word 'light' is here used of intellectual and moral enlightenment. In this sense the term is specially applied to the Lord Jesus, since He is the light that lightens the world, and is the source of all light. The apostles, the disciples of Christ, and all true Christian believers, are rays of the sun of truth, and are the enlighteners of the world, so far as they in their lives and teaching instruct men in what God Himself has instructed them. They must give light to the intellectually blind, and give new life to the morally dead.

"*The world,*" as in ver. 13, here signifies, not any one people, but the whole universe.

"*A city on a hill cannot be hid.*" Many of the towns in Judæa, as in other countries, were built on the summits of high rocks and hills, so that they were visible from a great distance. Mondrel tells us that near the spot where Jesus is supposed to have delivered His sermon stands on a mountain the town of Safat, which can be seen from afar, and it may be that the Saviour, when He pronounced these words, pointed towards the town which suggested the comparison between His disciples and a city built on a hill. They, too, must be seen from afar; nor must their works be hidden, and the eyes of the whole world should and will be turned towards them. To hide themselves, through weakness of spirit, would be as unnatural as for a city standing on a high hill to be invisible or hidden.

"*Do not place it under a bushel*": which would hide the light, and then there would be no reason for lighting the

candle. And so in relation to the Christian faith and all Christian people. They must be the light of the faith, and, by leading lives in conformity with that faith, enlighten mankind, and spread its blessing abroad throughout the world. Christians must not hide the light, but confess and preach the faith to all men, or else Christ's high purpose and aim can never be attained.

“*And so it gives light.*” Let your faith, your righteous life, and the pure confession of the faith within you, be seen of all men and be known everywhere, in every class of society, in every act performed at home or out of doors, in every season of happiness or of sorrow, in your days of wealth or poverty.

“*That men may glorify your Father.*” The motive actuating Christians to live thus in the world, is not merely that they may be seen by men, for this were pride and boasting, but the glory of their heavenly Father. He does not say: ‘Show your good works,’ for this would be wrong, but He says: ‘Let them shine forth, so that your very enemies may wonder at them and glorify, not you, but your heavenly Father.’ The Pharisees flaunted their good works before the world, that they might be seen of all men; Christians should not trouble themselves about this, but should rather be anxious that men glorify God, when they see the purity of their lives and faith. It is not praise of self they seek, for all such vainglory is sharply forbidden by the Saviour; but they seek that men should praise God, and this forms the end of Christian conduct in relation to others.”

From this explanation of the passage under considera-

tion, we can only conclude that Christ's words have no particular signification, no connection with what goes before or what follows, and were spoken to give the Church an opportunity of interpreting them after its own fashion. And if we read Reuss, we must arrive at the same conclusion. He pointedly declares that these words are out of place, though a meaning can be found for them. And this is his explanation of them—

"This second passage not only has no relation to what goes before or what comes after, so that it would be useless to try and find any close connection between its different parts, but the parallel passages in the other Gospels, that we have been obliged to select from four absolutely different contexts, suggest a reasonable doubt as to the propriety of the place assigned to these verses. Nevertheless, it will be possible to find a meaning for them that is in full accord with the tone of the whole discourse, the same meaning that the compiler who introduced them into the Sermon on the Mount must have had in view.

"The subject of this passage is, as before, the disciples of Jesus, but not in any way exclusively those whom he called to be his first apostles. He had just said that they must expect to be in conflict and at variance with the world, and that in many respects it would be their duty to accept such a position. But now, on the contrary, he speaks to them of duties which will bring them into close contact with the world, and establish direct and continuous relations between it and them. And this he teaches them in a figurative or allegorical way.

"*You are the salt of the earth.*' Salt serves to season our food, and chiefly to preserve it from corruption or

decomposition. Jesus, on another occasion, employed this same figure of speech, with special application to the making of bread, and in such a way as to make his meaning quite clear (Matt. xiii. 33). By the *earth* we are to understand the great mass of mankind, amongst whom his disciples are, and ought to be, an element of health, designed to penetrate it and communicate to it a virtue or quality indispensable to its well-being, just as leaven is for dough—paste a condition of taste and wholesomeness. It is, then, of the highest importance that this healthy principle, this active power of regeneration, be from the first really in them; for if they lack it, there is no means of replacing it.

Salt which has lost its natural force and taste cannot recover them, cannot, to speak literally, be resalted, and there is no possibility of restoring to it what it once possessed, but has lost. This must be understood to apply to a time when Jesus will no longer be with them, and consequently cannot stir up others to take the place of those who have failed in their vocation. He speaks here of the mass, and does not refer to the distinction that will eventually be made between those who remain faithful and those who fall away.

“*You are the light of the world.*” This figure of speech is so generally employed, that it will be sufficient to remark that its use here must not be confined to the progress of intelligence. The New Testament does not separate the spiritual from the moral nature in man. In the house, when a candle is lighted, it is to light the room; and it would be absurd to put under some piece of furniture the candle which is designed to give light. In the same way, those who have received the light which Jesus came to bring into the world, must in their turn make it of

use to others. It is not enough that they possess it themselves, nor is it fit that they should regard it as a thing of individual profit; their chief duty being activity in the world, work for the good of all, the work which later the Apostle Paul, though employing a different figure of speech, called edification. These are the good works of which the text speaks. If it referred to works of beneficence, Jesus would not have spoken of the necessity of letting them be seen. To *glorify God*, in biblical language, signifies, to put one's self on his side, to be converted to him.

"The succeeding portion of this passage, where Christ speaks of a city built on a hill, and which is to be seen from afar, somewhat spoils the simplicity of the comparison, and has without doubt been inappropriately introduced into the text by some unknown compiler. It cannot relate to the *duty* of which Christ is here treating, but simply states a *fact*. Applied to his disciples, this fact is that they will find themselves in the midst of the world, and that the eyes of men will be turned upon them; and from this will arise individual duties, easy to foresee, but which are not determined in the text; and it would be a strange and cold interpretation of the passage to represent the Saviour as saying: 'Even as a city built on the height of a hill *must* be visible from afar, so you *ought* to make yourselves seen of men.'"

It is plain that, not having understood the meaning of the words, "Blessed are the poor and vagrant," and having deliberately given these words another and unintelligible interpretation, the commentators can only give us an equally misplaced and unsatisfactory ex-



position of the passage following. But if we only bear well in mind the words and thoughts of Jesus, his discourse concerning the salt and the light ceases to be obscure, and, indeed, without it we should fail to understand what precedes and follows.

The words, "Blessed are you, poor and vagrant; for yours is the kingdom of God," are no flowery rhetorical sentiment, which the substituted phrase, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," undoubtedly is; but they convey a truth that is terrible and awful for those who regard the position they have made for themselves in society to be their highest good, but is full of joy and gladness for all who are poor and wretched.

And these words, understood in their full significance, require to be explained, and the verses that follow give us such an explanation. "You who are poor"—this is what they teach us—"are the salt of the earth, and you are blessed, because the kingdom of God is yours; but it is yours only so long as you are salt that has its natural strength and taste, so long as you know that blessedness consists in poverty, and so long as you wish to be poor. Then you are the salt of the earth, the adornment and the life of the world. But if you are vagrants accidentally, and wish you were not such, then, like salt that has lost its flavour, you are nothing worth, the refuse of the human race. Vagrants and poor, not content with their condition, are good for nothing, and are, in reality, trodden under foot by men. In so far as you understand that, you are blessed by and because of your poverty, you are the light of the world; and as light is not intended to be hidden, but to be exposed, so must you not be apostates from your poverty, or try to conceal it, but you should let it be openly exposed to all. And

thus your light shall be a light to others, and they, beholding your voluntarily accepted poverty and the blessedness of your life, shall understand and live the life of the spirit of your Father."

### III. THE EVERLASTING LAW

Matt. v. 17: Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἤλθον<sup>1</sup> καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον<sup>2</sup> ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας<sup>3</sup>· οὐκ ἤλθον καταλύσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

Do not think that I teach the law should be annulled. I teach, not to annul the law, but to fulfil it.

18: Ἀμὲν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἅτα ἐν ἧ μίᾳ κεραίᾳ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.<sup>4</sup>

Truly I say unto you, That so long as heaven and earth remain, every tittle of the law shall continue in force among you till it be fulfilled.

19: "Ὅς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ<sup>5</sup> μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν<sup>6</sup> τούτων<sup>7</sup>· ἱλαχίσιτον, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· ἱλαχίστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅς ὁ ἂν ποιῇσιν καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

So that if any one shall think even one of these few rules to be unnecessary, and shall teach men so, he shall be the least in the kingdom of God; but whosoever shall both observe and teach them, he shall be greatest in the kingdom of God.

20: Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἂν μὴ ὑπερίσεννη<sup>8</sup> ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλεον τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

I tell you beforehand, that if your obedience to the law be like the obedience shown by the scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God.

1. *Ἐρχεσθαι* in all the passages where it has a verb or verbal substantive as complement signifies, *to have*

come to make known, to explain, to show, to teach; or simply, to show, to teach.

2. *Καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον* signifies *to annul*; and *νόμος* with the article is used in the Gospels to denote the law of God, in opposition to the law of Moses. In this latter sense the same word (*νόμος*) is employed, but without the article. The following are examples of the use of this word with article as applied to the law in general: *Διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; (Matt. xxii. 36). *Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον, καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου* (Matt. xxiii. 23). And the following are examples of the use of this word without the article as applied to the law of Moses: *Παρασιγῆσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου* (Luke ii. 22, 23). *Καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου* (Luke ii. 24). Numerous examples of both these forms are to be found in the Epistles.

3. In many copies the words, *ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας*, are wanting. The *law and the prophets* was an ordinary expression, and it is very natural that the word *προφῆτας* should have been added to *τὸν νόμον*, though the addition is prejudicial to the sense of the whole passage; for the subject here spoken of is not the law and the prophets, but *the law in general*. Jesus says: "From all you have heard from me and seen of me,—the abrogation of ceremonies and the temple, and the doctrine I now preach, that the poor and vagrant are blessed, and the counsel I give that all should make themselves vagrants,—from all this you

may conclude that I give full licence to men, and teach them to do what they like, since there is nothing good nor bad, and that all law for men is abolished. Do not think that I teach this. It is not lawlessness I teach. On the contrary, I teach men to fulfil the law in its minutest points; and he who acts thus, that is, as I have just taught, shall be a child of the kingdom of God." Nor is this all. In many of the quotations of this passage made by the Fathers of the Church, the whole sentence reads thus: *Τί ὁκεῖτε; ὅτι ἦλθον πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας; οὐκ ἦλθον πληρῶσαι, ἀλλὰ καταλῦσαι.* "What do you suppose? That I am come to fulfil the law or the prophets? I am come, not to fulfil, but to annul." Only in this version is the introduction of "the prophets" at all intelligible. It is evident that the whole of this version was not accepted into the Canon, but the words, "the prophets," were borrowed from it and introduced into our text, where they have no meaning.

• 4. The eighteenth verse has always been a stumbling-block to our orthodox critics. This is what Reuss writes on the subject—

"On a first reading we are inclined to suppose that the Saviour's intention was to declare, in the most positive and emphatic language, his maintenance of the absolute authority of the law even in its minutest details. *The law and the prophets* is the consecrated formula employed in the synagogues as a general title for the holy books read in the public congregations, as I have shown in my *History of the Canon*. But on reflection we are prevented from adopting such a conclusion by the fact that the Christian Church has

annulled a considerable portion of the law, and exactly that portion to which the contemporaries of Jesus attached the highest importance; and we further remember how the Apostle Paul proclaimed loudly the abolishment of the law and its replacement by a regulating principle of an entirely different kind. And lastly, we cannot forget the many occasions on which Jesus either put himself above the law (Mark ii. 27; Matt. xii. 6), or declared that it had come to an end (Mark xiv. 58; John ii. 19), or reduced it to one of its elements in such a way as to reject the others, or, at least, to throw them into the background (Matt. xxiii. 23, xii. 7, xxii. 40, ix. 13), or lastly, directly condemned it as being imperfect (Matt. xix. 8, xv. 9). Unless we suppose a change to have come over his ideas, or admit a flagrant contradiction in the traditions that have come down to us of his teaching, we cannot but find these verses (18, 19) excessively perplexing and puzzling; and not a few commentators, to get out of the difficulty, have accused the Judaic Christians of having given a false colouring to the words of the Master, even if they have not gratuitously made him speak in a way favourable to their opinions and ideas. Others, ignoring all the rest, stop short at these declarations, and draw the conclusion that Jesus, for his part, never rose above the level of the 'narrow ideas adopted by his Galilaean disciples. We do not speak of a third supposition, which it is impossible to admit, that Jesus, when he spake these words had only in view the Moral Law. These suppositions are invalidated by two facts. First, Luke, who has always been called the Pauline and universalian evangelist, reproduces in his Gospel these same assertions. And secondly, our very text contains

elements extremely characteristic in an evangelical sense, but entirely opposed to the law. There is therefore no doubt that the declarations made in the eighteenth and nineteenth verses cannot be rejected under the pretext that they are purely and absolutely unauthorised; nor, on the other hand, can they be accepted in a sense that would be simply incompatible with this point of view."

All this is perfectly just, except this final conclusion, accepted in pure lightmindedness and without any justification, that for some unknown reason the supposition that Jesus had in view only the Moral Law is inadmissible. This simple denial is truly astounding; but perhaps still more astounding is the reference made to the text in Luke with the intention of showing that text to be in contradiction to all the suggested interpretations. Such an unsupported rejection of the perfectly clear and simple idea expressed in this verse would be inexplicable, were it not evident that the idea conveyed from beginning to end throughout the whole discourse has been missed and ill understood. And this misunderstanding and this attempt to give an artificial meaning to the text, arise from the same cause that originated the misunderstanding of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth verses. A false interpretation has been given to the first verse of the Beatitudes; what wonder, then, if we are presented with a cloudy and self-contradictory explanation of all that follows?

In the opinion of Reuss, as indeed of the Church also, the verses about the salt and the light are simply an interpolation that has no connection with what goes before, and the whole passage in Matt. v. 17-48 has been

arbitrarily introduced from another source, and is entirely out of place.

"This passage," writes Reuss, "which is out of harmony with all that precedes it, and fragments only of which are to be found in Luke, forms a discourse complete in itself, and should be studied apart in its entirety, although the evangelist has here and there introduced into it certain traits which, while they present some points analogous with the main text, were primitively foreign to it. This circumstance explains why this, one of the finest and most important pages in all the Gospels, still offers many difficulties, and has given rise to different misconceptions. It is easy to perceive that Jesus is here speaking of his relation to the law. The question is to know exactly what he said on this point."

The following is an extract made from the Archimandrite Michael's *Commentary*—

"*Verily*': a confirmation of the positive truth of what is said.

"*Till heaven and earth pass*': so long as the world stands; that is, till the end of time. Or it may mean: 'Heaven and earth shall sooner pass, and the world shall sooner come to an end, than the law remain unfulfilled in its spirit and in its essence.'

"*Iota*': a sign or little bent line by which one of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet is distinguished from another of the same form and shape. These words, therefore, mean that the smallest tittle and seemingly least important part of the law shall not be allowed to pass or remain unfulfilled, inasmuch as it is the positive

word of God, which cannot be spoken in vain or remain unaccomplished.

“ ‘*Till all be fulfilled*’: that is, in the spirit and in the essence, not in the letter. The whole law was a shadow of better things to come; but when the very image of these things appeared the shadow lost its significance, and that which the shadow forecast became a reality. Whoever fulfils the law of the New Testament, at the same time fulfils the law of the Old Testament, not in the dead letter, but in a more perfect way, in the spirit. Thus, for example, he who is not angry with his brother fulfils in the most perfect manner the law of the old covenant, ‘Thou shalt not kill’; for the man who refrains from anger will not commit murder.”

Like all the explanations given by the Church, this in reality explains nothing. It does not tell us what we are to understand by the word of God, in what relation the teaching of Christ stands to the law of Moses, or what precise meaning we are to attach to the term, “The Law.”

• If we only take care not to dislocate Christ’s teaching in this passage, but read it in close connection with what goes before and what follows, all will be quite plain, the necessary outcome of what precedes. Jesus says: “To enter the kingdom of God, a man must be poor and a vagrant”; that is, he must renounce all the shows of life. A vagrant always has been, and still is, a despised creature, who is, as it were, allowed to do whatever he likes, and who lives without any law. In the fifteenth and sixteenth verses Jesus says: “A man must be poor and a vagrant, not because he is forced to be such, but of his own will.” And in these two verses



he once more speaks of the necessity of men being poor and vagrants; but not as those for whom there is no law and to whom everything is permitted. On the contrary, they must be vagrants who fulfil the law and live by certain rules.

The term  $\delta \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ —that is, with the article—denotes the Moral Law

The parallel passage in Luke, which Reuss so quietly brings forward in support of his interpretation, proves most clearly from the place in which it occurs what we are to understand by the word  $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , and by the entire sentence, "not one tittle of the law shall fail." "The law and the prophets till John" (Luke xvi 16); but from that time the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and every man enters it by force. It is said, "the law and the prophets". that is, the written Jewish law was necessary till John, but now the kingdom of God is announced. And immediately after this follow the words: "Heaven and earth shall pass, sooner than one tittle of the law shall fail." Either Luke purposely brought together two texts which contradict one the other, or he understands by "the law and prophets", something that was annulled and abrogated from the time of John, and by the word "law" without the addition of "and prophets," something else that can never be annulled and abrogated as long as men exist.

The application of the word  $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , without an article, to the Moral Law is of frequent occurrence in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans: "Where, then, is thy boasting? It is destroyed. By what law? ( $\delta\iota\alpha \pi\acute{o\lambda\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ .) The law of works? No, but by the law of faith." ( $\delta\iota\alpha \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ .) "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith independently of the works of the law."

(χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.) "Do we, then, destroy the law (νόμον) by faith? In no way: but we establish the law." (νόμον ἱστώμεν.) (Rom. iii. 27, 28, 31.)

In other passages the apostle speaks of the law and prophets, of the written law: "If I do that which I wish not, I consent unto the law (τῷ νόμῳ) that it is good." "And so I find the law (τὸν νόμον), that when I wish to do good evil is within me." "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind (τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου), and making me a captive to the law of sin (τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας)." (Rom. vii. 16, 21, 23.)

In the first cited verses the apostle speaks of the Moral Law. And that Christ here refers to the Moral Law is made still plainer by the fact that towards the end of his sermon, after having specified all that we ought to do, he says: "In this," that is, in these rules, "is all the law and prophets"; meaning that these few rules replace all the written law. "I do not annul the law," he continues, "on the contrary, I fulfil it"; because the law remains for man more unchangeable than heaven and earth, "till all be accomplished."

In Luke we must understand, "till all be done according to the law." The idea here expressed is that the law, which shows and indicates what ought to be done, remains in force, and will remain as long as the world exists, till all be fulfilled. For the law can be annulled only in two cases: first, if the world should come to an end; secondly, if men always fulfil the law, so that the law becomes an indicator only of that which is not fulfilled, an indicator of departures from it.

5. *Λέγου* must be translated, *to count unnecessary*. "And they sought all the more to kill him, because he

not only counted the sabbath to be unnecessary (ἐλευ-  
τὸ σάββατον), but claimed God to be his Father, making  
himself equal with God" (John v. 18). "If a man on  
the sabbath day receives circumcision, that the law of  
Moses should not be counted unnecessary (ὥνα μὴ  
λυθῇ); are you angry with me for healing a man on  
the sabbath?" (John vii. 23).

6. Ἐντολή, an injunction. I do not translate it  
*commandment*, because we are accustomed to apply this  
word exclusively to the commandments given by Moses.

7. Τούτων refers to the commands, injunctions, rules.  
If we did not remember how the meaning of the Sermon  
on the Mount from its very opening words has been  
misinterpreted and distorted, we might find it difficult  
to understand how, overlooking, as it were, this word  
τούτων, it can have been supposed that Christ is here  
referring to the commandments of the Mosiac Law. If  
it were so, why should Christ speak of "these com-  
mandments"? Which commandments? All? Then  
there is no need to talk of "these" or "those," which  
he mentions as about to be annulled. How can it then  
be said that not one letter of the law shall fall through?  
And yet both the Church and Reuss understand these  
verses (18, 19) to refer to the commandments of Moses.

"We might with reason once more ask," writes Reuss,  
"to be allowed to regard these verses as having been  
arbitrarily introduced here and taken away from their  
proper context, and to take the twentieth verse in close  
connection with the seventeenth; but we do not insist  
upon this simplification of the text."

And this is how the Archimandrite Michael in his *Commentary* explains these verses—

“‘*Shall break*’: shall transgress or do anything contrary to these commandments; or by a false interpretation deprive them of their obligatory force, as, for example, by teaching that the violation of one of the less important commandments is no sin, and should expose the offender either to no punishment at all or to a very slight one.

“‘*One of these least commandments*.’ The Pharisees divided the law into the greater and lesser law; and with reference to the latter, they taught that to violate it was no sin, though in this category were included commandments relating to the essence of the law, such as the law of love, almsgiving, and justice. It is of these the Saviour speaks, declaring that they can be called least only according to the false teaching of the Pharisees. But Chrysostom and Theophylact interpret this passage differently, affirming that the Saviour does not call any of the commandments of the old covenant least, but that the term applies to the laws he himself gave, and that it is from modesty he thus names them. As in all things he humbled himself, and as in many places he speaks modestly of himself, so now he speaks in the same way of his law.”

But no explanation is given as to how we are to understand this passage. Jesus says: “You shall be *vagrants*; but there is, and should be, a law for every man; and now I will give you a few short precepts, and if you only observe them you shall be of the kingdom of heaven.” And then, by way of exhortation, he adds: “If you would enter into the kingdom of God,

you must be better than the Pharisees; for to enter into it your righteousness in relation to the law must be greater than that of the Pharisees, who do not fulfil the law."

#### IV. THE FIRST COMMANDMENT: BE NOT ANGRY.

Matt. v. 21 : Ἠκούσατε· ὅτι ἐρρέθη ταῖς ἀρχαίαις· Οὐ φονεύσεις· ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἑνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.<sup>1</sup>

You have heard how it was said to them of old time : Thou shalt not kill : and whosoever shall kill, shall be liable to judgment.

22 : Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ εἰκῇ,<sup>2</sup> ἑνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, Ῥακά,<sup>3</sup> ἑνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ·<sup>1</sup> ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ, Μωροῦ, ἑνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.<sup>3</sup>

But I say unto you : Whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be liable to judgment. And if anyone say to his brother, Rascal, he shall be answerable to the criminal court. And if anyone say to his brother, Madman, he shall be liable to the fire.

#### 1. Compare Num. xxxv. 10--34.

2. In many copies the word *εἰκῇ* is omitted; nor is it to be found in Luther's Bible, in the Vulgate, or in Tischendorff's version, and it is acknowledged to be an interpolation. It is scarcely necessary to insist upon this point. Every reader must perceive how this word is in flagrant contradiction to the whole teaching of the sermon. If it be only sinful to be angry without a cause, then a man may be angry with a cause. But who will be the judge as to whether there be a just cause or not?

I quote the Archimandrite Michael's criticism on the interpolated *εἰκῇ*—

“‘*But I say unto you.*’ Christ, in His quality of supreme lawgiver, speaks here, as on many other occasions, as one having authority, and not as the scribes and Pharisees. Is not His full power to be seen here? Does not His mode of speaking declare the lawgiver? Which of the prophets, just men, or patriarchs ever spoke thus? Not one. ‘Thou saith the Lord,’ they say, but not so the Son. They gave laws to slaves like themselves, but He—to his Slaves.

“‘*Whosoever is angry without a cause.*’ There is an anger which is, so to speak, lawful and just, when it is directed against a sin, against lawlessness, or against a crime, and arises from a jealousy for God’s glory and the salvation of our neighbour. God Himself is angry against sinners. Christ looked with anger on the Pharisees, who were hypocrites (Mark iii. 5). It is not of this kind of anger that He speaks here, but of anger without cause, that arises from self-love, and is not founded on any love for truth and virtue. If anyone is justly angry from spiritual jealousy for Christ’s doctrine, he shall not be judged.”

This interpolation is noteworthy as an example of those intentional perversions of the text to which the Gospels have been exposed. Many such examples might be given, where some little word is introduced, and the true meaning of a passage thereby entirely destroyed.

3. *Ῥακά*: a Chaldean word signifying *contempt*. It may be translated *reprobate*, *rascal*.

4. *Συνέδριον*: a special court of justice, having the power to pronounce sentences of death.

5. Γέεννα τοῦ πυρός : a valley consecrated to the worship of Moloch, human victims being sacrificed in his honour. To be given over to Gehenna, signifies *to be burned*.

The whole discourse, beginning with the example taken from the law of Moses as to how a man accused of murder was judged, proceeds on one and the same line of comparison. By the law of Moses a murderer was punished by the severest sentence of the law. But Jesus says : " As murder was forbidden by the law, do I with the same strictness forbid you to be angry in your heart against your neighbour. And still more strictly do I forbid the manifestation of this anger in words of contempt and insult ; but even yet more strictly do I forbid any greater show of anger than contempt, which is the act of a madman, whom it is impossible to treat or regard as a reasonable creature."

The degree of strictness in prohibiting the different kinds of anger is expressed by a corresponding severity of punishment. But it is plain that Jesus did not prescribe the punishment either of the Sanhedrim or of Gehenna. If we suppose that he did, then we ought at once to introduce Sanhedrims into our judicial administration. Or if we understand him to refer to punishment in another world, it is impossible for us to say what kind of Sanhedrims will be there. It is therefore manifest that neither Sanhedrim nor Gehenna must be understood literally. They are but terms to express the degree of punishment, which must correspond with the nature of the crime for which it is inflicted.

Matt. v. 23 : Ἐάν οὖν προσφέρῃς | So that if thou bringest thy  
τὸ δῶρον σου ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, | gift to the altar, and there re-

καὶ μνησθῆς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει memberest that thou hast a  
τί κατὰ σοῦ. brother who has something  
against thee ;

24 : "Ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου Leave there thy gift before the  
ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ altar, and go and must be recon-  
ὑπάγε, πρῶτον διαλλάγῃς μετὰ ciled to thy brother, and then  
ἀδελφῷ σου, καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν προσέφερε come and offer thy gift.  
τὸ δῶρόν σου."

1. "Then come and offer thy gift." It has already been said that gifts and sacrifices are not required by God. All the things necessary for offering up gifts to God were thrust out from the temple, and it was forbidden to bring any into it. It cannot be that Jesus contradicts himself, and here orders us to bring gifts to God. The latter words in this verse would be clearer if read thus : " And when thou hast gone and been reconciled to thy brother, thou offerest in that reconciliation thy gift to God." That we should understand these words in this sense, we gather from the Lord's Prayer, where our relation to God as transgressors is made to depend on our pardoning those who have trespassed against us.

This is the explanation of these verses as given by the Church :—

"To have an upright heart is more necessary and of greater import than to observe outward rites. The latter unaccompanied by the former have no worth in the eyes of God, and possess value in His sight only when joined with love and charity to our neighbour. Of course, where there is no possibility of being personally reconciled with our neighbour, we must at least make peace with him in our heart."



Reuss, having once got out of the true path by persuading himself that Christ is here speaking of the commandments of Moses, gives us the following characteristic commentary on this passage —

“To this first example the compiler appends two others, which appeared to him to belong to the same order of ideas

“The spirit of conciliation ought to be cultivated in opposition to the spirit of anger. The re-establishment of a good feeling between men at variance one with the other is a noble idea worthy of being the prime motive in all religious duties, and God will accept no offerings so gladly as those presented to him with this guarantee of sincerity. But the verse is not in its place, if we examine the context, it has nothing to do with the evangelical interpretation of the sixth commandment. The analogy is just sufficient to make us understand why the compiler introduced the verse into this place

“But even this slight analogy no longer exists, and the connection becomes entirely incomprehensible, if we pass on to the second of these verses, which Luke has preserved for us in a quite different context. In fact, the adversary here spoken of can be no other than a creditor who brings his debtor before a judge, in order that he may be cast into prison. Naturally, the debtor should lose no time in arranging matters before the warrant for his arrest is issued. We are told that by this example of prudent forethought, Jesus would teach us the importance of being reconciled with our adversaries. It is possible that the evangelist thus understood it, but, putting aside the fact that its application is left to the sagacity of the reader, the whole parable leads us far away from the main theme of the Sermon on the Mount.”

Matt. v. 25: "Ἰσθὶ εὐνοῶν τῷ  
ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ,<sup>1</sup> ἕως ἔτι εἴ ἐν τῇ  
ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτὸν· μήποτε σε παραδῶ  
ὁ ἀντιδικὸς τῇ κρίσει, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε  
παραδῶ τῷ ὑποκριτῇ, καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν  
βληθῇς.

Be well with thine adversary,  
whilst he is still with thee on the  
way, or else he will bring thee  
before the judge; and the judge  
will give thee over to the jailer,  
and thou shalt be cast into prison.

26: Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ  
ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἃν ἀποδώσῃς τὸν  
ἐσχάτον κοδραντίνον.

Then, thou knowest thyself,  
thou shalt not come out thence,  
till thou hast paid the last farth-  
ing.

1. *Ταχύ* is wanting in many copies; nor is it at all necessary, since the words ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ express the same idea, the necessity of being reconciled and making peace quickly.

2. *Ἀμὴν*, as well as the form ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, are constantly used in those places where Jesus affirms something that is well known to all, and therefore these words may be translated, *thou knowest thyself*.

According to Reuss, this parable is not in its place, whereas in our opinion it is the direct development of the idea already enunciated.

It is said that the inner, or spiritual, meaning of the precept ordering us to refrain from anger is that, so long as we have in our heart ill-feeling against our neighbour, we cannot think of God. And then the outward, or material, meaning of the precept is spoken of. Anger is our enemy, the adversary of truth and justice, ἀντιδικός; and therefore we should arrange and agree with him as quickly as possible, since we all know that it is more profitable to come to an agreement with an adversary before the dispute is brought to a judge.

This parable is also employed in Luke in exactly the same sense, as will be pointed out in its proper place.

In the exposition of nearly all his rules or commandments Jesus brings forward a twofold argument why we should accept them and fulfil his law: one of a subjective character, why it is good to do so, and the other of an objective character, why it is profitable to do so. And so here, in teaching us to become reconciled with our adversary before he brings us to court, he points out that, besides its being good to refrain from anger, it is also directly to our profit and advantage.

In the case of the second of Christ's rules of life, as we shall see immediately, the same mode of argument is employed.

#### V. THE SECOND COMMANDMENT: COMMIT NOT FORNICATION

Matt. v. 27 : Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη | You have heard how it was  
τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐ μοιχεύετε· | said : Commit not fornication.

1. In Leviticus (xx. 10) it is said: "Whosoever shall commit adultery with a married woman, with the wife of one of his countrymen, they shall both, the man and the woman, be put to death." The words in the text evidently refer to this commandment and the punishment for its violation.

Matt. v. 31 : Ἐρρέθη δὲ ὅτι ὁς ἂν | It was also said : Whosoever  
ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω | shall put away his wife, let him  
αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον· | give her a writing of divorce-  
ment (Deut. xxiv. 1).

32 : Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁς ἂν | But I say unto you : Whosoever

ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκ-  
τός λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν  
μοιχεύσασθαι· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην  
γαμήσῃ, μοιχεύεται·

shall put away his wife is not  
only guilty of wantonness, but  
leads her to commit adultery.  
And he who marries a divorced  
woman commits adultery.

28: Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς  
ὃ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυ-  
μῆσαι αὐτήν, ἤδη ἐμοιχεύεσθαι αὐτήν  
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

And to look on a woman with  
desire is the same thing as to  
commit adultery with her.

1. To make the meaning of this passage clearer, the thirty-first verse should immediately follow the twenty-seventh. The twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth should come directly after the thirty-first and thirty-second.

2. In many copies the words ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ are wanting, and it is better to omit them, since they only obscure the meaning of the passage.

Math. v. 29. Εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς ὁ σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔσφραζε αὐτόν, καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι, ἵνα ἀποληθῇ ἐν τῷ μέλῳ σου, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.<sup>1</sup>

And if thine eye ensnare thee,  
tear it out and cast it from thee;  
for it is more profitable for thee  
to lose one eye than that thy  
whole body should burn.

30: Καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιὰ σου ἁρπάζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτήν, καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι, ἵνα ἀποληθῇ ἐν τῷ μέλῳ σου, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.

If thy right hand ensnare thee,  
cut it off and cast it from thee;  
for it is more profitable for thee  
to lose one of thy hands than  
that thy whole body should burn.

1. The word δεξιός has here no meaning, and, instead of adding to the clearness of the remarks concerning adultery, serves to clog the sentence. It is evident that

the word has been transferred from the proverb about the right hand tempting a man. In both Matthew and Mark the proverb is repeated in another place, but without the addition of *δεξιός* to the substantive *ὀφθαλμός*.

2. *Σκανδαλίζειν* is derived from *σκάνδαλον*, a snare. Here, as everywhere else in the Gospels, the word is used in its literal sense. As a bird caught in a net would willingly sacrifice its eyes which betrayed it rather than perish altogether, and as a fox entrapped in a snare would sooner sacrifice one of its paws than lose its life; so should men learn that "the mouth of strange women is a deep pit, and he who falls therein shall be swallowed up" (Prov. xxii. 14). It is better to cast off all that seduces or ensnares us than to perish altogether.

3. It seems to me that the words *πᾶρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* (ver. 32) are wrongly translated, "saving for the cause of fornication." Any details as to the conditions under which a man may put away his wife are out of harmony and in contradiction with the whole tone of Christ's teaching. Either these words should be omitted, or the comma should be left out, and the proposition immediately following should be made to depend, not on the word "put away," but on the word "commit adultery." Then the meaning of the sentence will be: "A husband who puts away his wife, besides committing an act that is in itself wanton, is also guilty of leading the woman, by divorcing himself from her, into adultery, as well as the man who goes with her."

When explaining why we must not be angry in our heart against our neighbour, Jesus gave an inner, or

spiritual reason: "So long as we have anger in our heart we cannot think of God," as well as an outward, or material, reason: "It is less profitable for ourselves." So in the present case Jesus explains the inner, or spiritual, reason to be that a man who yields to carnal passions destroys his own soul, and that for him it were better to cut off all (for example, a right hand) that leads his soul to destruction. And, at the same time, he points out the second, or material reason: that lust and fornication, like anger, grows fast and spreads quickly of itself. He therefore says: "No married man must take to himself other women and put away his own wife, because, if he abandon her, she will be led to commit wantonness, as well as the man who goes with her; and in this way there is no limit to the spread of vice."

Once more, Reuss finds these verses to be out of place, and writes as follows:---

"Here once more the compiler interpolates two verses intimately connected one with the other, and which are to be found elsewhere in an entirely different context. The first may, perhaps, be considered to be in its proper place, coming as it does after what has been said concerning the sin committed by a man who looks on a woman with desire. The connection may be understood in the sense that it were better to be blind than to allow ourselves to be led away by thoughts which eventually become culpable acts and bring us to everlasting perdition. Nevertheless, we have serious doubts as to these verses, which do not appear to us to be at all in their proper place. First, we do not see how the second proposition, in which the right hand is spoken of, can contribute to throw any light on the leading idea.

Secondly, the express mention of the *right* eye completely destroys the one possible association of ideas, since a man blind of one eye is not worse off under the supposed circumstances than a man enjoying the sight of both eyes; besides which, it is a well-known fact that the loss of one of his members will not change the vicious habits of an individual. It must also be objected that the comparison drawn in this figurative language seriously compromises the moral idea. We are sooner to lose a member than the whole body, sooner to deny ourselves something less important and less necessary, than to lose all. If we admit this comparison, the sin is, to tell the truth, represented as being *relatively* worse, whereas it is in reality *absolutely* bad. As we shall see later, all these difficulties disappear when we find the verses occurring in another and more suitable context."

And this is what Theophylact has to say on this passage:—

"The Lord does not destroy the law of Moses, but corrects it, and forbids a husband to hate his wife without a cause. If he puts her away for some potent reason, as for adultery, he will not be condemned; but if it be not for adultery, he will be judged; since he thereby leads her to commit sin. And he who takes her to himself becomes an adulterer; because, were no one to receive her, she might very likely return to her first husband and submit to him."

Thus, according to the interpretation given by Reuss, Jesus here gives us an example how to fulfil the law of Moses; according to the Church, as represented by Theophylact, he corrects the law, that is, defines for us

what adultery is. But, in fact, Jesus does not define anything. As in his first commandment against anger, he explains why sons of the kingdom of God cannot harbour anger, so now he tells us why it is impossible for them to be fornicators.

He says: "If a man desires to have a woman, he destroys his own soul, and, by yielding to his desire and putting away his wife, he spreads wantonness among both women and men." He exposes the innate evil of wanton desires, but does not define what is, or what is not, adultery. He only lays down the second of his short rules of life.

The first of these rules was that "we should never be angry." And having given the commandment, he proceeds to show that it was necessary and reasonable. And now he gives his second commandment: that "we should not look on the feeling of love to a woman as a good thing"; after the manner of our Christian society, by whom it is held up as a fine thing, and its praises are sung in millions of books. And, as he generally does, Jesus proceeds to point out the necessity and reasonableness of his second rule or commandment.

#### VI. THE THIRD COMMANDMENT: DO NOT SWEAR

Matt. v. 33: *Ἦρασι γὰρ οἱ ἰσχυροὶ ὅτι ἔρρεθον τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· ὁὐκ ἐπιτηδεύετε, ἀποδώσετε δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τὸν ὅρκον σου.*

You have also heard how it was said to them of old time: Observe thy oath, and fulfil that which thou hast sworn before God.

1. "And thou shalt not swear falsely by My name, neither shalt thou dishonour the name of thy God: I am



the Lord, thy God" (Lev. xix. 12). "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not leave him unpunished who takes His name in vain" (Ex. xx. 7). These are the two texts to which the Church refers as an authority for her teaching concerning oaths, and there are no others. Both texts speak of oaths quite differently to the way in which they are spoken of by Christ. The meaning of the Old Testament texts is, that men must keep and observe their oaths.

Matt. v. 34 : Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν.  
Μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως·<sup>1</sup> μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ  
ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ·

But I say unto you: Swear not at all; do not swear by heaven, for God is there.

35 : Μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν  
ἐστὶ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς  
Ἱερουσόλυμα,<sup>2</sup> ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ  
μεγάλου βασιλεῖος·

Nor by the earth, for it is God's; nor by the Church, for it is also God's.

36 : Μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου  
ὀμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα  
λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι.

And do not swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair on thy head to be white or black.

37 : Ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν· Ναί,  
ναί· Οὐ αὖ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων,<sup>3</sup>  
ἐκ<sup>4</sup> τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν·

And, therefore, let thy word be: Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for all that is in excess of these words is born of deceit.

1. In most copies we have the reading *μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*; and this is correct, since the whole force of the sentence resides in the word *ὅλως*.

2. I have changed the word *Jerusalem* into the word *church*, so that, without changing the idea, the form of expression might be made more intelligible.

3. I have translated τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων, *all that is in excess of these words*, to make clearer the meaning of περισσόν.

4. I have adopted this translation, *is born of*, because such is the meaning of ἐκ.

This is what Reuss says of this passage, which is short, but very important, by reason of the prophetic significance it has for us--

"The second precept relates to oaths. The Decalogue in the third commandment and the law in general (Lev. xix. 12) content themselves with forbidding perjury, whether in the strict sense of the word, signifying a lie that has been uttered in the name of God, he having been invoked as a witness, and which is consequently an act of high treason against the Divinity, or in the sense of the violation of a promise given under the sanction of an oath. No special mention is made in the text of what we generally call vows. Jesus goes much further: he completes the law (as he had done in giving his second commandment) by contradicting it to some extent, or at least by representing it as imperfect, below the level on which sons of the kingdom of heaven are bound to place themselves (Matt. xix. 8). He peremptorily forbids all swearing. The wide usage of this solemn form of affirmation is due to the lack of truthfulness among men, who have sought by this means to protect themselves against those frauds of which they might otherwise be made the victims. This fact alone compels us to regard oath-taking as unworthy of a society like that of the children of the kingdom of heaven, who should content themselves with *yea*, or *nay*,

as the case may be. Those words alone ought to be sufficient guarantee. All that men can add to them, by way of removing any kind of mistrust, must rather prove that that mistrust is necessary, and that, consequently, the Deceiver, or Devil, the instigator of all evil, must in some way or other be concerned in it, since the man who swears justifies by that very act the suspicions of him who demands the oath."

It is plain that Reuss does not understand this passage. The Church understands it, but purposely hides its true meaning, wilfully distorting the doctrine of Christ for its own sordid and self-seeking purposes. The following is the commentary of the Archimandrite Michael:—

"*Thou shalt not forswear thyself.*" This is not a literal quotation of the commandment in the law of Moses as given in Lev. xix. 12 and Deut. xxiii. 21-23. Do not forswear thyself. If thou makest a vow to the Lord, do not delay to pay it. The words of Christ evidently mean the same: 'Do not swear falsely, swear in confirmation of the truth; and, if thou takest an oath, do not violate it.'

"*Thou shalt perform thine oath*': that is, 'under oath thou must speak the truth, and perform what thou hast promised with an oath.' An oath is a solemn affirmation in the name of God of the truth of what is said; and it is naturally assumed that God will call to account the man who dares to lie under oath, for such an act is equivalent to blaspheming the name of God. In the course of ages the Jews, in order to avoid the invocation of God's name, had adopted the custom of swearing by a number of different things, such as the heavens, the

earth, Jerusalem, the temple; and these oaths they did not regard as being solemnly binding. In this way, they thought, they could swear falsely without violating the outward letter of the law.

“*Swear not at all*”: by any of these methods just spoken of, and which at that time were so constantly in use. For all has been created by God, and created holy; and, consequently, to swear by any of God’s works is equivalent to swearing by the Creator; and to take a false oath in His name is to violate the sanctity of the oath itself.

“*Neither by heaven*.” Heaven is the special habitation of God, and is therefore called the throne of God. To swear by heaven, is to swear by Him who sits on the throne, to swear by the Lord.

“*Nor by the earth*.” The earth is named God’s footstool, and to swear by it is the same as to swear by God Himself.

“*Nor by Jerusalem*.” Jerusalem is called the city of the great King, that is, God, who is the true King of the whole earth, and especially of the Jewish kingdom, the capital city of which was Jerusalem, where was the temple, the only one in the world where the worship of the God-King could be celebrated.

“*Nor by thy head*.” In ordinary life this was a very common oath, one of those vulgar asseverations in which the people of every country are fond of indulging. It meant the same as to swear by one’s life; that is to say, ‘I pledge my life’ or, ‘Let my life be forfeited and let me be struck dead, if I do not speak the truth.’ God is the creator of life, and it is in His hands to cut short or to prolong life. Consequently, he who swears by it, swears by what does not belong to him, but to God, and thus he swears by God.

“‘*Not one hair.*’ So little is our power to effect any change in our life that we cannot alter the colour of any one of our hairs, and, therefore we must not swear by anything that is not ours.

“‘*Yea, yea, Nay, nay.*’ This does not mean that a Christian must always employ, instead of an oath, these exact words, but it means only that he must affirm a truth, or contradict a lie, simply and straightforwardly. And he must speak the truth and not lie. Any assertion beyond this, strengthened by any kind of oath, proceeds from the deceiver, from evil, or—as the devil is the cause of all evil—from the devil.

“We evidently must not apply this prohibition to swear at all to any lawful oath, to any of those oaths in the name of God which are indispensable in public and private life. God himself confirms the oath taken before a judge, when, in answer to the words of the priest, ‘I swear by the living God,’ the witness answers, ‘Thou hast said.’ In the same way, among the Jews, the judge generally repeated the form of oath, and the witness made it his own by responding, ‘Verily, even so be it; thou hast said.’ The Apostle Paul frequently calls God as a witness to the truth of his words (Rom. i. 9, ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 23, ii. 17; Gal. i. 20, Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5). The forms of oath prescribed by the law of Moses were not changed by Christ (Ex. xxii. 11; Lev. v. 1, Num. v. 19, Deut. xxi. 12-14). Among the hypocritical Pharisees these forms were often replaced by meaningless empty oaths.”

This, then, is the third of the rules which Jesus has given us that we may, by observing them, enter into the kingdom of God. The position taken up by the Church

is the same in relation to them all. The Church flatly and directly denies them.

In the first it is said: "*Be not angry.*" The Church introduces into it the little word *εἰκῆ*, and teaches that we may be angry, and in this way the words of Jesus are stultified. "If thou wishest to pray, first go and be reconciled with thy brother." The Church says this may be inconvenient, and, therefore, a man may pray without first going to be reconciled, even though people suffer through him, are in want or in prison through him, if only he repeats to himself the formula, "I am reconciled in my heart." And once more the words of Jesus are made naught.

It is said: "*Commit no fornication*"; and, by way of example, we are told that whoever puts away his wife is thereby himself an adulterer and makes his wife an adulteress, as well as involving in the same sin the man who marries the divorced woman. The Church understands this as though Jesus had given us rules by which we can decide when divorce is lawful and when it is not. And what is the result? The Church sanctifies divorce.

It is the same with the third rule; only the divergence between Christ's teaching and that of the Church is still more striking. The third rule is set down so pithily, so clearly, that—with the exception, perhaps, of those superfluous verses in which we are told what oaths are not to be employed—any misunderstanding of it would seem impossible. This is the whole of the third rule: "Those of olden time said: 'Observe thy oath'; but I say unto you: 'Swear not at all, neither by God, nor by thy head, because all is in the power of God, and in his hands is thy head, or life; and,

therefore, say 'Yea, yea, Nay, nay, and all that is in excess of these words is evil.' It is impossible to misunderstand the meaning of these words. And if the Church falsely interprets them, it knows why it lies, it knows that the order of society and its own existence depend on oaths. If it would preserve itself, it must lie. Jesus condemns this very oath which the Church is willing to justify.

The true meaning of the oaths is what they really say. They say *Swear not*. And this is in closest harmony with Christ's whole doctrine. When a stipulation is confirmed by an invocation to God, and a man declares, "May the good God strike me dead if I do not perform what I have promised," by these words God is called to be a security, and this constitutes an oath. In explaining to us why we should not swear, Jesus says that a man cannot justly make any such stipulation, because he has nothing to give in the way of security. If he swears by heaven, he makes God his security. But God in no wise answers for him. And therefore all these oaths are meaningless.

It, again, a man swears by his head, only he who is not of the kingdom of God can take such an oath. For every member of the kingdom of God knows that he is entirely in the power of God, and can do nothing of himself, cannot even change the colour of a single hair on his head. Every oath is a promise of what this or that man will do in any circumstance, but how can a man, who acknowledges the kingdom of God, that is, God's power over him, make an absolute promise in any affair of this world? One and the same affair of this world may be good and bad, agreeable to and contrary to the will of God. I promise under oath to go somewhere,

on Saturday, and on that same day, a friend, my father, my mother, is dying, and prays me to remain. Or I swear I will give five shillings to someone at a certain time, and meanwhile a starving man begs me to give him these five shillings; how can I refuse him? Or I swear loyalty and obedience to some Ivan Ivanovitch, and he orders me to march with an army and to kill a number of people in battle. But God has commanded: "Thou shalt not kill." Such things might be done when the will of God was not known, in the time of the law and the prophets, but not now, when the kingdom of God has already come. Man is in the power of God, and must obey God alone. His one business is to do God's will. Therefore, why should he swear, by whom, and under what pledge? We must for this reason not swear at all; but let us say "yea," if it be yes, and "nay," if it be no: and let us learn that every kind of promise accompanied by an oath is sinful, and proceeds from some evil design and purpose.

#### VII. THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT: RESIST NOT EVIL

Matt. v. 38: Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδὸντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.

You have heard that it was said: An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.

39: Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε βραχίονι ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου αἰσάγῃ, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

But I say unto you: Resist not evil; he who strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the left.

41: Καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἕν, ἔπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

And whosoever shall by force make you go a mile for him, go two miles for him.



42: Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε διδόν· καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῇ.

And give to everyone who asks you. And run not away from him who wishes to borrow of you. And he who has taken something from you, ask it not of him back again.

40: Καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν,<sup>2</sup> ἄφεσ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον.

And, therefore, if a man wishes to go to law with you, that he may take away from thee thy shirt, give him also thy coat.

Luke vi. 37: Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ὅπου ὕετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.<sup>3</sup>

And go not to law, that others go not to law with you; and seek not the condemnation of another, and others shall not seek thee; pardon others, and they shall pardon thee.

Matt. vii. 2: Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

For if thou judgest others at law, they shall also pursue thee; and with the same measure as thou measurest shall others measure unto thee.

3: Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς;<sup>4</sup>

Why dost thou see the speck of dust in thy brother's eye, but dost not perceive the straw that is in thine own eye?

4: Ἡ πῶς εἰσὶς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου ἄφες ἐκβάλλω τὸ κάρφος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου;

How wilt thou say to thy brother: Brother, I will take out the speck of dust from thine eye, when thou dost not perceive the straw in thine own?

5: Ὑποκριτά, ἐκβάλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ

Hypocrite! First, remove the straw out of thine own eye, and

τάτε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ καυθὸς  
ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

then shalt thou see how to take  
out the speck of dust from thy  
brother's eye.

Luke vi. 39: Εἴτε ὁ παραβολὴν  
αὐτοῖς· Μήτις δυνατὸν τυφλὸς τυφλὸν  
ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέρωτις βόθυνον  
πεσούνται;

Do you really think the blind  
can lead the blind? Behold, they  
will both fall into a pit.

40: Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τοῦ  
διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ· κατεκτισμένος ὅς  
γὰρ ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκων αὐτοῦ.

A disciple is not greater than  
his teacher. Only when he has  
thoroughly learned all, shall he  
be as his master.

43: Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ ἡ ἐλπίς καλὴν,  
τοιοῦτον καρπὸν φέρειν οὐδὲ ὁ ὕψος  
καπερὶν, τοιοῦτον καρπὸν καλόν.

For it is impossible that a good  
tree should bring forth bad fruit.  
There is no good tree from which  
bad fruit can be grown.

44: Ἐκαστος γὰρ ὁ ὕψος ἐκ τοῦ  
ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκειται.

Every tree is therefore known  
by its fruit.

Matt. xii. 35. Ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος  
ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς  
καρδίας ἐκβάλλει τὰ ἀγαθὰ· καὶ ὁ  
πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ  
θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει τὰ κακά.

And so the good man from the  
good treasure in his heart brings  
forth good; but the evil man  
from the evil treasure in his  
heart brings forth evil.

Matt. vii. 6: Μὴ δότε τὸ ἅγιον  
τοῖς κυσὶ, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργα-  
ρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων,  
μήποτε καταπαήσωσιν αὐτὸν· ἐν τοῖς  
ποσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν  
ὑμᾶς.<sup>6</sup>

Do not give that which is holy  
to dogs, and do not cast before  
swine that which is most precious  
to you, that they may trample it  
under foot, and then turn upon  
you, and rend you.

15: Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδο-  
προφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς  
ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἑσθλὴν  
δὲ ἔσθ' ἡ λύκος ἀρπαγῆς·

Avoid false prophets, who come  
to you in sheep's clothing, but  
within they are ravenous wolves.

Matt. xii. 34 : Γεννήματα ἔχουσιν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν, πονηροὶ ὄντες; ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ.

Generation of vipers! how can you speak for the good, when you yourselves are evil?

36 : Λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶν ῥήμα ἄσῳγόν, ὃ ἐὰν λαλήσωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ἐν ἡμέραις κρίσεως.

For I say unto you, that every idle word, spoken by men, shall be accounted for in the day of separation.

37 : Ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιώθησθαι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθῆσθαι.

Seeing that by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

1. "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," is quoted from the following passage in Exodus (xxi. 1-36 and xvii. 1-20) :—

"Now, these are the laws which thou shalt set before them. If thou buyest a Hebrew slave, let him work for thee six years, but in the seventh year let him go free without paying any ransom. If he came single, let him go free single; but if he be married, let his wife go free with him also. If his master has given him a wife, and she has born to him sons or daughters, let the wife and her children remain with their master, and let him go free alone. But if the slave shall say: 'I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go free' then let the master bring him before the judges, and place him near a door or a doorpost, and bore his ear with an awl, and he shall remain his slave for ever. If a man shall sell his own daughter into slavery, she cannot go out to service as the male slaves go. If she please not her master and he does not betroth her to himself, he shall let her be redeemed, but he shall have no power to sell her to a stranger, since he himself has rejected her. If

he betroth her to his son, he shall grant her all the rights of a daughter. And if he take to himself another wife, she shall not be deprived of her food, her raiment, and her right of cohabitation as wife. And if he do not allow her these three things, let her go free without payment of any ransom. He who smites a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death. But if he have no evil intention, and God has let him fall into his hands, then I will appoint thee a place, whither the murderer shall flee. And if a man shall intentionally slay his neighbour with guile, and escape to my altar, thou shalt take him thence, and put him to death. He who smites his father or his mother shall be put to death. He who steals a man who is an Israelite, and sells him into slavery, or if he be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death. He who reviles his father or his mother shall surely be put to death. When two men quarrel, and one of them smites the other with a stone or with his fist, and he does not die, but is obliged to keep his bed, if he rise again and go out from his house with the help of a stick, he who smote him shall not be put to death, but he shall pay him for the time he has lost from work, and shall give him means to be healed. But if a man strike his slave or woman-servant with a stick, and they die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. If, however, they survive one day or two, he shall not be punished, for they are his money. When people strive and strike a woman who is big with child so that she bare not, but no other evil follows, the guilty one shall pay such penalty as the woman's husband may impose, and he shall pay in the presence of arbitrators. And if any further evil follow, then shall he surely give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand,

foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, hurt for hurt. And if a man smite his slave or woman-servant in the eye, so that it perish, let them go free for the sake of the eye. And if he knock out his slave's tooth, or the tooth of his woman-servant, let them go free for the sake of the tooth. If an ox gore a man or woman to death, the ox shall surely be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten, but the owner of the ox shall not be held guilty. But if the ox was formerly wont to gore, and the owner has been warned thereof, but has taken no precautions, and the ox kill a man or woman, the ox shall be stoned, and its owner be put to death. If a ransom-fine be laid upon him, let him pay the ransom for his life that has been imposed upon him. Whether it be a son or daughter who has been gored, let him be treated according to this law. If the ox gore a slave or woman-servant, let him pay thirty silver shekels to their master, and let the ox be stoned. If any man shall open a pit, or if anyone shall dig a pit and not cover it, and an ox or ass fall into it, the owner of the pit shall pay for it, and give money to their owner, and the corpse of the animal shall be his. And if a man's ox shall gore the ox of his neighbour, let them sell the living ox, and divide the money between them, and let the dead ox be also divided. Or if it be known that the ox has formerly been wont to gore, and his owner has not taken any precautions, then shall he pay *ox* for *ox*, and the dead animal shall be his. If a man steal an ox or sheep, and kill it or sell it, he shall give five oxen for the ox, and four sheep for the sheep. If a thief be found breaking into a house, and he be smitten so that he die, no blood shall be shed for him; but if the sun rise upon him, blood shall be shed for him: the thief shall pay for the

theft, and if he has nothing, let him be sold for the payment of what he has stolen. If the thing be found in his possession, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep, he shall pay double their worth. If anyone, by letting his cattle graze on another man's field, shall injure a field or vineyard, let him pay an amend with his own field, and if the whole field has been grazed, let him make restitution of the best of his own field, and of the best of his own vineyard. If a fire break out, and catch the furze and set fire to the stacks of corn, or the standing corn, or the field, he that caused the fire shall pay an amend. If anyone entrust his neighbour with money or goods to keep, and they be stolen from his house, and the thief be found, let him pay double; but if the thief be not found, let the master of the house go before the judges, and swear that he has not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods. For all things about which there is a dispute, for an ox, an ass, a sheep, dress, any kind of lost thing, which another claims to be his own, let all such matters be brought before the judges; and he whom the judges condemn shall pay his neighbour double. If any one entrust his neighbour with his ox, or ass, or sheep, or any animal, and it die, or be hurt, or be driven away, no man having seen it, then shall an oath be made between them both that he who took the animal to keep has not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods, and he shall pay nothing. And if it be stolen from him, he shall make the owner an amend for it. But if it be torn in pieces by a wild beast, let him bring the torn flesh in proof thereof, and he shall not be made to pay for that which was torn. If a man borrow cattle of his neighbour, and it be hurt, or die, the owner not being with it, he shall pay the owner for it. But if the owner has

been with it, then he shall not pay; and if it were taken on loan for money, let it go for that sum. If a man entice an unwedded maid and sleep with her, let him give her a dowry, and take her to wife; but if the father will not consent, and does not wish to give his daughter to him, let him pay as much as he thinks sufficient for a dowry to a maiden. No fortune-tellers shall be suffered to live. Whosoever shall lie with a beast shall be put to death. Whosoever shall sacrifice to any god, save unto the Lord only, shall be destroyed."

This is the entire passage to which Christ directed the attention of his Jewish hearers when he said: "It was said of old, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." In quoting these words, which occur in the law relating to any injury done to a pregnant woman, it is plain that Jesus was not speaking of this one particular law, but of the offences and punishments in general which form the subject of these two chapters in Exodus. He speaks of the old methods of protecting men from evil, such as courts of law or punishment by death, and he then adds: "But I say unto you, do not strive with evil"—or still more correctly, do not protect yourselves from evil—"in this way; but do exactly the opposite." And he proceeds to show what that opposite way is.

In consequence of this, the verses relating to human courts of law, as they stand in the seventh chapter of Matthew, and in Luke immediately after the passage bidding us 'be merciful and give to him that asks,' I have transferred to this chapter, where they find their natural place in connection with the passage from the Old Testament respecting criminal courts of justice. The transference of these verses to the seventh chapter of Matthew, where they are entirely out of connection with what goes

before and follows, can easily be explained by the fact that this passage, which really refers to courts of law, has been understood to refer to individual judgments conveyed in words. It is also for these reasons that I have placed the fortieth verse of the fifth chapter of Matthew after the forty-first and forty-second verses, since the fortieth verse refers to courts of law, and then the verses from the seventh chapter of Matthew and the thirty-seventh from the sixth chapter of Luke follow in their natural and logical order.

2. *Καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβῆναι, and to take from thee thy shirt.*

It is in the Sermon on the Mount that the word *κρίνειν* is used for the first time, and its true signification may be defined by this verse. If it were not for the false interpretation of the words *κρίνειν* and *κρίνεσθαι*, in the sense of evil-speaking, it never could have come into anyone's head to give a gloss to the evident meaning of the words, *to go to law with you and take thy shirt*. To tell us that in this sermon, where Jesus is expounding to vagrants the essence of his doctrine, he teaches them that they should not be back-biters, would strike us as a senseless joke, were we not accustomed to scoffingly sacrilegious interpretations favoured by the Church. Fortunately, the text before us is so plain that it does not admit of misinterpretation; but the Church has done its best to deprive it of all meaning.

“*If any man will sue thee at the law.*” That we should let the unjust man,” writes the Archimandrite Michael, “who wishes to despoil us of something, take still more from us, is a rule of conduct which, like the



preceding one, must be understood in a general sense. The Saviour wishes us to exhibit a like gentleness, both when men strike us, and when they attempt to despoil us of our possessions. But none the less, the lawful defence of our property is not forbidden, any more than a just lawsuit before a judge is here condemned. The Apostle Paul, when he learned that the members of the Church at Corinth went to law one with another, did not positively condemn all lawsuits among Christians, but simply asked: "Why do you not rather take wrong?"

And this is what Reuss says—

"We have again a precept enjoining patience and resignation in presence of an injustice; submission being preferable to any procedure that may indeed be lawful, but is foreign to the brotherly feeling by which we may hope to conciliate harsh, violent, and aggressive men. But in this latest precept it is no more a question of doing unto others as we would be done by, but of repelling an attack made upon our person or property. We must then consider this precept separately. As to the form in which it is cast, that is to say, the examples chosen to render it intelligible to the people, we have to make this remark. We cannot but notice the difference between the two versions in what is said concerning the cloak and coat. At first we are, perhaps, tempted to prefer Luke's version, since the man who robs another of his dress will begin with the overgarment. But in spite of this, the other version appears to me to be preferable. The question is an unjust suit before a court, by means of which a man is maliciously despoiled of his property. But we must not forget that his cloak is considered by the poor man to be his most valuable

possession, inasmuch as it serves him for a bed. The meaning, then, is: 'If any malicious enemy tries by legal chicanery to rob you of a part of your property, rather than adopt energetic measures of self-defence, let him take all.' The Greek word, which is of Persian origin, and which I have translated *corré*, strictly relates to State services which a man is called upon to perform. The advice given, therefore, is that we should rather do more than is required of us than refuse altogether.

"Here we are met with a difficulty, in presence of which the moral teaching of Jesus has often been reproached with being unpractical, since no social order can possibly exist, if we once give a free hand to rogues and cheats. To rebut this objection it is not enough to affirm that individual duties, and not social obligations, are here spoken of, or to refer to other passages in the Scriptures where the security and protection of social order are recognised. It must be admitted that the precept given by Jesus, though couched in figurative language, is serious and practical. We all know that there are blows a Christian may be called on to endure and to pardon, which are less easy to bear and more irritating than any given by the hand. attacks directed against the fruit of our labours more malicious than any lawsuit, burdens more heavy to endure than any extortion we may have to support unresistingly. We speak of those cases where no positive law is violated, but where a superior delicacy of feeling compels us to submit to the selfish exactions of another; cases in which, if we availed ourselves of our strict rights, we should have no hesitation in saying 'No,' were it not for the spirit of Jesus, which makes us say 'Yes,' in obedience to his example.

"The forty-second verse is still more foreign to the context, since it has no connection whatever with the law of retaliation. In the main, we must say of this rule of conduct what we have just said of the preceding one. Taken literally and in its widest application, this rule, if acted upon, would do more harm than good. But there will always remain the principle which Luke has introduced into his text, but which our evangelist only mentions later: 'It is not my interest, but that of my neighbour, which ought to govern my acts.'"

Any man who wishes to discover the meaning of Christ's doctrine, and who does not believe the actually existing order of things to be the realisation of a Christianly organised society, must acknowledge that the words *μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε*, really mean, *to go to law; to be brought before a court of law*, and that what Jesus forbids is, "to go to law with a person."

3. In Luke vi. 37 it is said: *καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε*. "And go not to law, that others go not to law with you; and seek not the condemnation of another, that others seek not your condemnation; but pardon others, and they shall pardon you." In Matt. vii. 1 it reads thus: *μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε*. "Judge not, that you be not judged." But in many copies the reading is exactly the same: as in Luke, *μὴ καταδικάζετε*: *do not judge before a court*.

4. These verses are connected in the same way in Luke. That they do not there occupy their proper place cannot be doubted, if we give their true meaning.

to the words κρίνειν and καταδικάζειν, instead of foisting on them a meaning of their own. Judges and magistrates,—these are they who see the speck of dust in the eyes of others, but do not perceive the straw that is in their own; they are the blind leaders of the blind, the teachers of anger and revenge, and who are unable to teach anything else.

5. This verse in Luke follows the one about the straw in the eye, and evidently refers to judges. There cannot be good judges if they propagate the rancorous desire of punishment and revenge; and the sentences pronounced by those who judge and condemn must be tainted with evil.

6. This verse is found only in Matthew, and follows the one about the straw in the eye. Both the Church and Reuss give a meaning to the verse that does not flow from the sermon itself. Thus the Archimandrite writes as follows:—

“*Do not give that which is holy unto the dogs.*” The language of this verse is figurative and allegorical, and represents a man who throws something holy, something that has been consecrated, and is brought as an offering to God, to be defiled by dogs. Under the term *holy things* is included everything relating to the Christian faith: the truths of the gospel, the commandments, the rules of life, the doctrine of Christ, and all sacred things.

“*Pearls.*” These precious objects, used for adornment, serve to represent high spiritual things, as well as the deep truths of the Gospels and the Christian faith. St. Athanasius understands the term *pearls* to refer, in

particular, to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

*“Dogs and swine.”* These unclean animals signify the morally depraved, and those who are unable to receive the truths of the gospel, to whom all that is holy and spiritual is foreign and even hateful, since they cannot understand its worth.

*“Trample underfoot.”* Just as swine, which do not know the value of a pearl, will trample it underfoot; so depraved men, who do not recognise the high worth of evangelical truths, mix them up with unclean ideas, pervert them, and often turn them into ridicule. In many other places Christ attributes to their depraved lives the rejection by certain men of His perfect doctrine, and He orders the door to be shut upon them, since all spiritual teaching only makes them still more bold and insolent.

*“Turn and tear you to pieces.”* Savage dogs, tortured with hunger, and voracious swine, to whom has been given something they cannot eat, instead of their natural food, will in rage turn upon the man who has angered them without satisfying their hunger, and tear him to pieces. In the same way, depraved men, unable to understand and accept the gospel truth, will angrily turn upon the very preachers of truth, heaping upon them every insult, and not seldom even putting them to death. The meaning, then, of Christ's words, put into plain language, will be: ‘Do not present evangelical truths or anything sacred to people who are depraved, dishonest, and evil, lest they, through ignorance of what is holy and precious, defile it, confounding it with the wisdom of men, or perverting it and covering it with ridicule, and that you yourselves may not be destroyed.’

by them.' How often in their career as preachers had the apostles to experience the truth of these words, when called upon to endure every kind of suffering at the hands of the evil, senseless, and malicious. Our Lord here equally condemns the dishonour we do to God's word by neglecting to observe His precepts. The ordinary consequence of such neglect is that they who are without the pale of the faith imagine that His precepts may be disregarded at the good pleasure of men, and it is for the same reason that they boldly rise up and with their bitter reproaches and accusations, as it were, tear us and those who violate God's word to pieces."

Reuss writes on this passage in the same spirit. But it seems to me that the meaning of this verse flows out from what has just gone before, and is far simpler than the interpretation forced upon it by the Church. The main point is, that we must not go to law. If a man sues his neighbour before a court, and seeks justice from judges who are guided by the law of a tooth for a tooth, he thereby throws away to dogs, or to be trampled underfoot by swine, that which is dearest, and in man—the sentiment of justice. Dogs and swine trample underfoot this feeling, and tear him to pieces, that is to say, themselves condemn him, or secure his condemnation at the hands of others.

Such is the fourth of these short rules of life, which are designed to teach us how to fulfil the law. Like the preceding ones, this rule plainly shows that, when Jesus spake of fulfilling the law, he did not refer to the law of Moses, but to the universal, everlasting, moral law. Jesus does not teach us how to fulfil the law of

the books of Moses concerning oaths, but how to fulfil the everlasting law, by which all oaths are forbidden.

In the same way, with reference to justice, Jesus does not teach us to fulfil the law of Moses, but plainly says that human justice is evil, and teaches us to fulfil the everlasting law, by which we are forbidden to resist evil. The aim of the law is alone retained, and the retention of this aim is the justification of his rule of life. The aim of human law and the administration of human justice is the well-being of man. To obtain this, it is said in the law: "Pluck out the eye of him who has plucked out thine; extract a tooth from him who has extracted one of thine; cut off the hand of him who has cut off thine; and let him be put to death who has killed another." "But I say unto you," declares Christ, "to encompass the welfare of men, defend not yourselves from evil people. Do not in anyway defend yourselves. Have you been struck on one cheek? Offer the other. Does a man wish you to work for him? Do double the work he requires. Do you know that someone wishes to borrow of you? Do not shirk him, but give twofold; and what thou givest, do not ask back again. Does a man sue you at law, that he may take your shirt from you? Let him take also your coat."

Christ dwells on this point, and instances different cases in which the unjust man can offend the just man, and in all these cases he tells us directly and plainly what we are to do, and what we are not to do; that we must give way in all things, never have recourse to man's justice, never to seek the protection of courts of law, and never to have anything to do with them. The aim of the law is that none encroach on the liberty, individuality, or life of another. There cannot be at

one and the same time a law: "Thou shalt not kill," and a law: "Thou shalt kill in such and in such cases."

The fourth rule is the necessary outcome of the first: "Be not angry, but be reconciled with thy brother." It is based on the denial of the rights of human courts, inasmuch as they derive their authority from a false law.

Jesus says: "Do not go to law, and do not condemn; but pardon, pardon everything. You must pardon, and then you shall be pardoned. But if you go to law and condemn, men will go to law with and condemn you: and the evil will have no end."

As when giving the former rules of life, so now Jesus explains the fourth rule from two points of view; subjectively, that is, for each individual; and objectively, that is, for all. To each individual he says: "How can any man judge another? For he who judges ought to see what is good and what is bad; but how can he do this, when he himself judges, that is, wishes to be revenged and to punish? In the very fact that he judges, he commits evil; and if he judges, being himself blind, he is like a blind man seeking to lead the blind." Such is the explanation of this law for the individual.

The objective lesson, in reference to all men, is this. "First, if a man sues at law, others will sue him; and secondly, whilst he imagines he is correcting and teaching men, he in reality is spoiling and perverting them. What does he teach? To punish. A pupil can learn from his master only what the teacher knows. And if the teacher instructs us that we must avenge ourselves on others, it is this lesson of revenge which the pupil learns. But if people teach one another the duty of revenge, the evil can only spread deeper and deeper.



They say that all this is done for the good of mankind, and they put to death. But no one can kill with a good intention, any more than bad fruit can grow on a good tree; for in the same way as from a good tree we gather good fruit, vengeance and punishment cannot proceed from a good man. And, therefore, if men punish, do not believe them to be good." Such is the general meaning of this law.

And now, let us see how the Church interprets Christ's law—

"*Do not resist evil*': an evil action done by some bad or evil man; and, as the source of evil is the devil, we may understand by this word *evil*, the devil, who acts through a man that commits an offence. Can it be, then, that we are not to resist the devil? We are to resist him, but in the way the Saviour has commanded; that is, with a spirit ready to endure evil. We may then be sure of overcoming the deceiver.

"*He who strikes thee.*' The feeling of love and gentleness that replies to an offence by the readiness to endure a fresh offence, the desire to satisfy doubly an unjust demand, the willingness to give twofold to him who asks,—this is the best and highest proof we can give of the true Christian spirit. But it will be understood that all these commandments enjoining patience under wrong, repudiation of revenge, are primarily directed against the Jewish love of revenge, but do not forbid the adoption of common measures for the restriction of evil and the punishment of the evil-doer, or even precautionary measures on the part of individuals to secure the inviolability of their rights, the restraint of criminals, and the prevention of injuries done to others by evil-minded

persons. Otherwise, we are doing with the laws of the Saviour what the Jews did with the law of Moses, observing the dead letter, and thereby making them serve to the propagation of vice and the suppression of vice. Christian love must be like the divine love that restrains and punishes evil, and Christian love must endure evil only so far as it does no wrong to the glory of God and the salvation of our neighbour. In all other cases evil must be restrained and punished; and this is especially the duty of a government. The Lord himself, when struck on the face, said to the offender: 'Why dost thou smite me?' He himself taught his disciples to save themselves by flight from persecution and oppression. The Apostle Paul, when an injustice was done to him, instead of submitting without a murmur, openly protested before the magistracy and authorities, who had ordered him to be whipped, and reproached them with violating the law.

“*Judge not.*” A simple judgment, or well-intentioned appreciation of the conduct of others, such as are the inevitable accompaniments of private and still more of public life, is not forbidden by this law. But it condemns all judgment of the conduct of their fellow-creatures by a self-constituted, and therefore illegal, court of judges, or the personal judgment of private individual character, what we may call society tittle-tattle, in all which cases the judgment passed is prompted by self-love, vanity, or pride. But judgment of the character of this or that act of our neighbour, and even the relation we are consequently induced to take up towards him, is permitted, if only it be founded on a true and perfect knowledge of all the facts connected with the act we condemn, and is further prompted by

pure zeal for the glory of God. Christ himself, and the apostles, and all their true followers, always judged and condemned acts that are contrary to the faith and to God's honour, and took proper measures against all that in their judgment was evil. Jesus does not speak of this kind of judgment, but of judgments that are unjust, inspired by self-love and egotism, or gratuitous judgments suggested by personal interested motives, and particularly when they are passed by men who are more corrupt than those they condemn so glibly. Most probably the Lord had in view the Pharisees, who, proud of being righteous and pure in their outward conduct, severely judged the acts of others, without troubling themselves to inquire into the causes and motives of the conduct they censured, or caring to correct their own lives. The Lord, therefore, spake thus, not that we should refrain in every case from judging or condemning others, but chiefly to expose the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and scribes, who judged others, but did nothing to correct or improve themselves."

"These rules," writes Reuss, "are closely attached to what has been said just before (Matt. v. 25, vi. 12, 14 15). For it is impossible not to perceive that it is the judgment passed by God which is here compared with the judgment passed by men, and their reciprocal relations are here set forth. At first sight we are inclined to regard this conception of God as anthropopathic, when, for example, it is said that God will judge men as they judge their fellow-creatures; as though the passions, antipathies, and prejudices which so often prompt and taint our judgments could be attributed as motivating the Supreme Judge of all. But the point of comparison is

centred, not in accidental defects, but in the presence or absence of that brotherly love which should ever govern and direct strict justice. We must not forget that God, pre-eminently the holy and the just, has the right to judge and condemn us for every fault and transgression, and to punish us accordingly; whilst we who are ourselves sinners, do wrong to be stern and severe towards others. We have urgent need of the mercy of God, and, therefore, must above all things be animated by a like feeling of mercy one towards another."

Passing over the use of the word *κριθῆτε* in Luke vi. 37, where it is generally translated *be judged*, *κρίνειν*, standing alone, might perhaps be made to signify *to judge, to condemn*. Its original signification is *to weed, to separate the good from the bad*; and it means *to adjudge, to give each his share*; but it does not mean *to judge by word*. Here it is joined with the word *καταδικάζειν*, and expressly to prevent the possibility of its being misunderstood, and it is simply impossible to translate the word *κρίνειν*, *to judge*. The word *καταδικάζειν*, according to its derivation from *δικάζειν*, can only signify, as our lexicons tell us, *to pronounce a judgment against a person*.

But this is not all. These words immediately follow the injunction to turn our left cheek to the striker, to give our coat to him who takes our shirt, whilst in Luke they directly follow the statement that by the law of Moses justice was obtained by means of judges and punishments. "I now tell you," says Christ, "do not defend yourselves from evil, and then you will obtain justice." It would seem that the natural deduction to draw from this must be that we ought not to go before

judges, or sentence others to punishment. And even if it were not said directly afterwards, "Judge not, and do not sentence to punishment," it still would be clear that this is to be understood, since Jesus Christ instructs us to pardon all men. But how can there be any question of punishment, when Christ teaches us all "not to resist evil, and not to revenge"? In the commentary he makes on the first rule: "Do not kill," it is also said: "Do not even be angry with thy brother." Moreover, does not all his doctrine of pardon, all the parables of the fallen woman being forgiven, the debtor being excused payment, the Lord's Prayer, which bids us forgive those who trespass against us,—does not all this teach one and the same thing? But here in two emphatic words, to which it is impossible to give any other meaning, it is said: "Do not sue another before a judge, and do not condemn another to punishment." And yet, what do we see? All the churches, all the commentators, tell us that this simply means that we are to avoid calumniating others, and nothing more. Not to scandal our neighbours, and not to speak ill of others—this, of course, is an excellent and rare virtue; but the real meaning of what is said in these verses is something more than this, namely, not to sue others before courts of law, not to punish, not to take revenge, not to seek the amendment of others by law." And thus the fourth rule, as given by Jesus, exactly as the three preceding rules, is set forth, so that, if the whole passage were expunged from our Bibles, it would make no change in the teaching of the Church; but, on the contrary, would rather make that teaching more consistent and more intelligible.

And it is the same with the fifth rule of life.

## VIII. THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT: DO NOT WAR

Matt. v. 43: Ἦκουσατε ὅτι· ἔβλεθ' ἡ Ἀγία· οὐκ ἐστις τὸν πλησίον σου, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου. You have heard that it was said: Seek the happiness of your neighbour, and take no thought of your enemies.

14: Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑμῶν, καὶ καταραζέμενους ὑμᾶς, καὶ τοὺς μισούντας ὑμᾶς, ὅπως ὦν ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμᾶς, διακόντων ὑμᾶς. But I say unto you, Seek the happiness of your enemy; seek the happiness of those who take no thought of you; seek the happiness of those who threaten you, and pray for those who do you wrong.

45: Ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ αὐτοῦ ἀναστρέφει ἐπὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ κακοῦ, καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀκακοῦ, καὶ ἀδικούντος καὶ ἀδίκου. That you may become equal sons of your Father in heaven. He orders the sun to rise upon the good and the bad, and he sends his rain on the just and the unjust.

Take vi. 33: Καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀγαθοποιήσῃτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς, τοῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀρεκατοὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποιῶσι. And if you seek the happiness of those who seek yours, what merit have you? People of all nations do the same.

32: Καὶ εἰ ἡ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί ὑμῖν χάρις, ὅτι οἱ ἀρεκατοὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποιῶσι. And if you seek the happiness only of your brethren, in what are you better than those of other nations? People of all nations do the same.

Matt. v. 48: Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὑμεῖς ἐστε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅς ἐστις ὁ ἀγαπᾶς πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Be, therefore, good to all men, as your Father in heaven is good to all.

1. Lev. xix. 17: "Be not at enmity with thy neigh-

bour; rebuke him not, and do not impute sin to him." Besides this passage, Christ refers also to those places which treat of love to our neighbour, and the great law: "Love God and love one another." The following texts are concerned with hate of our enemies:—

Ex. xxxiv. 12, 13: "Take heed that thou makest no covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be a snare in the midst of thee. Destroy their altars, break their statues, cut down their sacred groves, and burn with fire the images of their gods."

Deut. xx. 1-19: "When thou goest out to battle against thy enemy, and seest that he has more horses and chariots than thou hast, be not afraid of them, for the Lord thy God is with thee, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And when thou approachest to the battle, let the priest come forth, and speak unto the people. And he shall say to them: 'Hear, oh Israel, this day you approach to battle against your enemies; fear not, be not dismayed, and be not afraid of them. For the Lord your God goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies, and to save you.' And the commanders shall speak unto the people, and shall say unto them: 'He who has built a new house, and has not yet used it for the first time, let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man enjoy its use. And he who has planted a vineyard, and has not yet had profit of its fruit, let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man reap the profit of it. And he who has betrothed a wife, and has not taken her, let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man take her.' And the commanders shall further speak to the people, and say: 'He who is fearful and faint-hearted,

let him go and return to his house, lest he make the hearts of his brethren as faint as his own.' And when they have spoken all these words to the people, then shall they appoint war-captains to lead the people. When thou goest against a city to take it, propose peace unto it. And if it consent to make peace with thee, and open its gates unto thee, then shall all the people that are within it pay a tribute unto thee and serve thee. But if it agree not to conclude peace with thee, then shalt thou besiege it, and make war against it. And when thou shalt smite all its male inhabitants with the sword, women, and children, and cattle, and all that is within the city, take unto thyself, and enjoy the spoil of thine enemies, whom the Lord thy God has delivered into thy hands. Thus shalt thou do with all the cities which are very far from thee, and which are not of the number of these cities. But in the cities of those people whom the Lord thy God shall give into thy possession, thou shalt not leave one single soul alive. But thou shalt give them over to utter destruction: the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizites, the Hittites, the Jebusites, even as the Lord thy God has commanded thee, lest they teach you to practise all the abominations wherewith they serve their gods, and that thou mayest not sin before the Lord thy God. When thou shalt besiege a city for a long time, it and take it, thou shalt not fell its fruit-trees to use them in the siege, for they are man's sustenance."

1. 'Εχθρός signifies *adversary, enemy*. The word is here used in the sense of the corresponding Hebrew



word in the books of Moses, *a person belonging to another people, a philistine*. Everyone not a Jew was *ἐχθρός*. In this place it evidently has the meaning, since it is used in opposition to *πλησίος*, which in gospel language signifies *fellow-countryman*. It was once asked: "And who is my neighbour?" The true answer is: "Those of another tribe, and even the Samaritan" (Luke x. 29-37).

The following are the remarks made by Reuss on this passage:—

"The last antithesis between the law and that of evangelical morality is, to the point of view of the summing-up of what has gone before, to a certain extent, the same, in any case, is its development and completion. The law says: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour.' Nowhere does the law say in so many words: 'Thou shalt hate thine enemy.' He who is the neighbour was the Israelite; according to the Pharisees, the friend was even the only neighbour. The hatred of foreigners, and their identification with an enemy, was the natural and inevitable result of the narrow view of the old religious state. Jesus is therefore not unjust towards the law in formulating his statement as he has done. His contemporaries, at least, had no reason to contradict him in this respect. His fulfilment of the law in bringing it back into accord with the original intention of the Creator, who is the common Father of us all, is a feeling of fraternity to which the world had hitherto been a stranger. Happily, his formula of duty in this respect has no need of a commentary, incomplete as the realisation of the ideal has always been. We shall therefore confine ourselves to one or two brief observations. The text in Matthew (v. 44)

has in the early copies and in the ordinary editions been filled up, from the narrative in Luke, which is more detailed, though it adds nothing to the leading idea. The result of a love that is not confined within the limits traced by the imperfections of our neighbour, but which, in its indensity, aspires to a resemblance with the perfection of God, is that the Christian becomes his child, a son worthy of his Father. For it is manifest that the perfection of God, here proposed as the ideal we are to follow, can only be understood of what we call his moral qualities. The fact that it must ever be impossible for us to reach this ideal—a fact too evident to our reason and conscience—must not be allowed to dull our wish to attain it. This is affirmed in the text by the use of the future tense instead of the imperative mood, and we are thus encouraged to march forward in this direction. What is said of the sun that shines on all indifferently, and of the rain that fertilises every field, cannot serve as a material and direct proof of God's universal love; for there are also natural plagues which strike equally without distinction men of every moral condition. But it is an illustration of the heavenly grace offered freely to all men, of the long-suffering patience which bears with us all, and consequently of the feeling that ought to animate us in our relations one to another. So long as love, charity, beneficence, and the other social sentiments and duties are regulated by a principle of reciprocity, they possess no value, for interestedness is not a moral element. This we can find among the vilest and most wicked of men, among those who are complete strangers to a recognition of the true God. The love of a Christian must be thoroughly free from all interested motives."

It is strange that whilst he perceived that Jesus is here speaking of our relations towards foreigners, Reuss should have invented a mystic interpretation of these words, and failed to see their plain and manifest meaning, inculcating as they do the end and aim which worldly communities even now pursue with so little success. It would seem as if he feared to give the words of Jesus their simple and intelligible, but, at the same time, deep and profound meaning.

This is what the Church has to say of the matter—

“*Love your enemies.*” An enemy is a man who does us evil in some way or other. There are two kinds of love to men. The first is a kindly feeling towards a man whose life and conduct we approve of, and who therefore pleases us. The second is a kindly feeling towards, and a desire to do good to, those whose lives and actions we disapprove of, and whose ill-deeds in relation to ourselves or others we oppose. The latter feeling is the love we ought to show to our enemies. It is impossible to like the conduct of a man who offends and injures us, or who outrages the laws of God and man; but whilst loathing his acts, we may wish the harm to himself, we need not repay evil for evil, we may comfort him in his necessity and in his difficulties, we may law in him services, and pray for his everlasting happiness. This kind of love to an enemy is the best evidence of the high degree of perfection to which they have attained who practise this virtue. They have reached the highest stage of virtue; for what can be higher than this?

“*Bless them who curse you.*” A frequently occurring enlargement of the common precept enjoining love to our enemies, by which we are shown wherein this love

to those who in various ways manifest their enmity may be proved. *To bless* an enemy properly signifies, 'not only to speak no ill, but to speak well of him; not to keep silent concerning his better qualities, but to praise them, to bring them to light, and to wish and to pray for his happiness and well-being.' *To offend* literally means 'to sue a person unjustly before a court, to accuse wrongfully, to decime in words or in deed.' It is plain that a love for our enemies which should manifest any sympathy with their conduct and acts, would not be in accordance with this command of Christ. On the contrary, true love sometimes requires that we should accuse and reproach a man when, owing to his acts, the glory of God is insulted and men are turned aside from the path of salvation. It is for this reason that our Lord Himself and His apostles not seldom addressed their enemies in words of threatening reproach. Let us now trace the nine degrees by which Christ would bring us to the top of perfection. 1. Do not give the first offence. 2. When the offence has been given, do not retaliate anger on the offender. 3. Not only refrain from doing to the offender what you have suffered from him, but remain patient and passive. 4. Submit humbly to suffering. 5. Give more than thine enemy even desires to take from thee. 6. Do not hate him. 7. Even love him. 8. Bless him. 9. Pray to God for him. Such are the stages towards perfect love."







